The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXI NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1929 NUMBER 784

Contents

The Week 52

Editorials

Hoover Plays His Part 55
Resurrecting the Foreign Service 57
The Battle of the Styles 58

General Articles

The Christian Science Censorship. Craig F. Thompson 59
Mexico's New Leader ..... Carleton Beals 62
The Late Demented ..... Felix Ray 64
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 65
Pines Are Perilous (verse). Robert P. Tristram Coffin 66
Maurice Ravel ..... Paul Rosenfeld 68
The Last of November ..... Stark Young 67
Raison d'Etre (verse) ..... Dorothy Reid 69

Correspondence 70

Reviews of Books

Presidential Timber ..... Robert Morss Lovett 73
Mr. Dobrée's Intentions ..... R. P. Blackmur 74
The Imperial Dollar ..... Harold Norman Denny 75
The Growth of Reason ..... Nathan Israeli 76
Notes on Novels 76

The Week

MR. HOOVER'S first message to Congress is a characteristic utterance. It is long, thorough, conscientious, making specific recommendations in regard to a wide number of subjects, such as might have been made by a corporation executive. It contains few surprises, and even these are of a sort consistent with his character. He again endorses the World Court, and promises to sign the protocol and send it to the Senate. He expresses pious hopes for the success of the London Naval Conference, and while he deplores the present size of armaments throughout the world, congratulates the United States on the efficiency of its military services. He points to a reduction in the public debt of some nine and a half billions, urges the one percent tax cut, and renews the appeal he made at the beginning of the special session in regard to the tariff. He urges the necessity of increased appropriations for the State Department, which is discussed in an article in this issue of The New Republic; recommends that the Federal Power Commission be reorganized so that it shall not consist of busy members of the President's Cabinet; and recommends a congressional committee to deal with Muscle Shoals, which shall not merely investigate and report, but shall be authorized to make contracts for the disposal of the power. In this connection, he states his usual opposition to government operation of the power plant. He asks for action looking toward railway consolidation; quotes, with seeming approval, the suggestion that branch banking be permitted under conditions which will retain a considerable degree of local autonomy; and avoids saying whether the St. Lawrence waterway project is feasible, by remarking merely that the United States is waiting for Canada in regard to it. His remarks about the Wall Street crash are what was to be expected, as are his observations on prohibition and law enforcement. He is perhaps at his best in discussing the humanitarian and welfare activities of the government, all of which he evidently intends to support and extend.

THE President makes one suggestion which is new, coming from him, and deserves warm support. He is embarrassed by the situation in Haiti, where we still have 700 Marines, and where the nominal Haitian government is actually under the thumb of the American occupation. He proposes, "if Congress approves," to send a commission to Haiti "to review and study the matter in an endeavor to arrive at some more definite policy than at present." The situation has been investigated before by committees, including one consisting of United States Senators, and the facts ought to be easily available to anyone. Nevertheless, Mr. Hoover's new commission would help call the attention of the public to the painful story of what we have done in Haiti in the last fourteen years, and should, therefore, be useful in creating the public demand in the United States which is, apparently, the only thing that can bring our domination to an end.

WHILE it is not yet clear whether China has already formally capitulated to the Russian demands in Manchuria or has only entered on negotiations which will conclude in substantial agreement to Russia's conditions, it is certain that Russia's resort to force has brought China to terms, and that the Chinese Eastern Railway will revert to joint Chin-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ese-Russian control, its status when the Chinese seized it last summer. The Red Army's invasion of Manchuria, although exaggerated in the press, was impressive enough to the Chinese closest to the threat to lead the local Manchurian government to communicate with Moscow directly and accept the terms laid down in July in the Russian ultimatum. These terms are, in effect, the restoration of the *status quo ante*. Mukden's surrender was made public by Moscow, and at first denied by the Nationalist government in Nanking. Mukden itself continues to be less explicit about the terms than is Moscow, but the Nanking government has now officially announced the delegates who are to negotiate with Russia. With the immediate threat of the Red Army suspended, China will no doubt seek to temporize and bargain for concessions to save its face while yielding, but it has already acknowledged its inability or unwillingness to meet Russia's show of force and, therefore, has no choice but to retreat. If a war is thereby prevented, it is a fortunate choice even for China, for to neither side is the Chinese Eastern Railway valuable enough to be worth a resort to arms. At the same time, the strenuous if belated preparations of the American and associated governments to invoke the Kellogg Pact will have become supererogatory, a fact which may have saved those governments considerable embarrassment.

AS EXPECTED, the Reichstag has rejected the so-called Liberty Law, the measure aimed by the German Nationalists at the Young Plan and its sponsors in Germany. The measure now goes to a national referendum on December 22, when its defeat is certain. At every stage through which it has passed, the Liberty Law has revealed the low estate to which German extreme nationalism has fallen. It mustered only a few thousand votes above the necessary 10 percent of the electorate required to bring it before the Reichstag. There, it did not even command the united support of the Nationalists, forty members deserting the party for common sense. Thus Herr Hugenberg's pretentious ambitions for a Fascist dictatorship are being quietly deflated by the electorate, despite the effective campaign of propaganda that astute publisher has been able to conduct through his chain of newspapers. The most effective answer to his propaganda has been given by the event. On the day that his bill to save Germany from the Young Plan came to a vote, the last French soldier was leaving Coblenz, and negotiations were proceeding for German recovery of the Sarre basin.

WHEN Dwight Morrow was appointed Ambassador to Mexico, The New Republic editorially endorsed his selection, saying he was a good man and should make a good ambassador. Promptly, several of our readers wrote protesting letters, saying that Mr. Morrow, as a partner of J. P. Morgan, was a bloated capitalist from whom nothing good was to be expected. We feel the passage of time has vindicated our original judgment; Mr. Morrow has done one of the most distinguished pieces of diplomatic service in recent American history, not only in straightening out the tangled relationship between the United States and Mexico, but in helping solve the vexed internal questions of that country, the quarrel between church and state, and the virtual bankruptcy of the Mexican government. The fine abilities he has displayed should be of equal value in the United States Senate, where he will be sent by New Jersey late in 1930. With much of Mr. Morrow's philosophy The New Republic has been and continues to be in disagreement; but that does not prevent our recognizing his usefulness as a public citizen, or welcoming the ambition on his part to serve his country.

MR. EDWARD N. HURLEY has a new plan to outlaw war, which was foreshadowed by an article published last summer in the Saturday Evening Post by Mr. Richard Washburn Child—an article answered in our pages by Dr. James T. Shotwell. The plan is to have war outlawed, not by governments, but by a couple of dozen leading industrialists of three or four nations. These men, according to Mr. Hurley, control the production of a few basic minerals and chemicals without which war could not long be waged. They would only have to agree not to sell their products to any nation bent on making war, in order to stop hostilities. We doubt, in the first place, whether they are all on good enough terms with each other so that they would carry out a unanimous policy in this respect, especially under conditions when large war profits were to be had for the asking. But if they were, and are really in a position to exercise such control in war time as Mr. Hurley recommends, the power is an extremely dangerous one to be in private hands. Governments which did not challenge it in a time of emergency would be surrendering to a veritable capitalist dictatorship. Even in time of peace, a distinct problem of control is presented by the existence of a few men who may be able to decide, in the private interest, production, prices and wages. What public force is big enough to cope with them?

THE DICTATORSHIP in Hungary is one of the cruelest in Europe; and that, as anyone knows who has studied post-War conditions, is no mean achievement. Particularly ruthless has been the treatment of political prisoners by the Horthy government—so much so, that in the past few weeks these unhappy victims have resorted to the only means of protest at their command, the hunger strike. Their immediate grievances were frequent beatings, censorship of their reading (which is limited to the Bible) bad and insufficient food, and unhealthy sanitary conditions. Since they have been on strike, some of them have been flogged, some confined in straitjackets, some forcibly fed, some subjected to two, or all three, of these treatments. Four

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prisoners are already dead, and since many more are refusing to eat, the number of deaths is likely to be much larger in the near future. A group of American liberals, including Roger Baldwin, E. C. Lindeman, Arthur Garfield Hays and Father John A. Ryan, have protested against the treatment of these prisoners, in telegrams, to Count Széchenyi at Washington and Prime Minister Bethlen at Budapest. An Emergency Committee for the Release of Hungarian Political Prisoners has also been formed in New York, to seek justice for these men, who number perhaps a thousand, and include the leading Socialists and Communists of that country.

THIS is the happy season of the year at which we all try to ruin our digestion by eating four times as much candy as usual. It is, therefore, a good time to remind our readers, and especially those in the vicinity of New York, that there is only one way by which they can make sure their candy is made in clean factories by workers who have decent working conditions and hours. The Consumers' League some years ago investigated conditions in the New York candy trade, producing a report which few will be able to read without having their sweet tooth permanently set on edge. As a result of their study, they have drawn up a "white list" of those manufacturers who comply with a set of minimum standards. These manufacturers are pledged to a general working week of fifty hours; a minimum wage of $14 a week, which seems pitifully small but is far better than the average in the trade as a whole; to the furnishing of seats for the workers, and the maintenance of a temperature not lower than 64°, whenever colder rooms are not absolutely necessary; regular medical examination of workers, and the provision of such washroom facilities as ought to be taken as a matter of course by decent people anywhere. These standards are modest enough; yet the only way you can be sure that your candy was made under conditions as good as are suggested, is to buy from the manufacturers on the white list. Many of them distribute throughout the country, so that wherever you live, you can avail yourself of this service. We suggest that our readers write to the Consumers' League, at 289 Fourth Avenue, New York City, for a copy of the list—and look before they eat.

AMERICAN Negroes are disappointed because Mr. Henry Carter, an official of the State Department, has been appointed as *chargé d'affaires* to Liberia. The Negroes had been hoping that one of their race might be chosen as our representative to this black republic, and many of them had as their candidate Mr. Clifford Wharton, now secretary of the legation, a graduate of Boston University Law School, and one who has performed his present duties creditably since 1925. Mr. Carter is said to have been active in furthering the Firestone concessions in Liberia, and this fact is adduced by the Negroes as peculiarly unfortunate in view of the forthcoming investigation, by an international commission, of slavery charges. This commission will be composed of one representative of the League of Nations, one Liberian and one delegate from the United States. It is understood that our State Department is seeking an American Negro to represent us on the commission, and it is to be hoped that it will not choose a second-rate politician for this purpose, but a man of outstanding ability and position. It would be a grave misfortune if this individual were of a sort to take orders from American capitalists or their friends, and to lay us open to the charge of trying to sabotage the investigation.

MR. CLARENCE STEIN, prominent New York architect and formerly chairman of Governor Smith's Housing and Regional Planning Commission, predicts that the skyscraper will strangle New York. "I prophesy the destruction of New York," he is quoted, "not by wartime enemies, but by itself. The greatest enemy of New York is the skyscraper. The rebirth of New York will be a planned New York." The reply of other architects that "the skyscraper has come to stay" does not answer Mr. Stein. Every time you increase many-fold the number of persons who must work on or over a given plot of ground, you increase equally the number of persons who must use the streets and transit systems to reach that location, and the expense of all the public services helping to maintain it, such as water, fire and police departments. Already the number of skyscrapers in the Grand Central zone has created a terrific congestion, which promises to be greatly intensified in the near future. At the same time, the value of abutting property is decreased, because the big building destroys the light and air accessible to neighboring ones. Even if the necessary transport of people and things to and from the big buildings should not present an insoluble physical problem, what of the increased costs which they engender, and which must lead either to uneconomically high taxes and rents or to municipal bankruptcy? It is true that the skyscrapers we have are here to stay a long time, but there is a limit to the number of new ones which can be built. Only by planning in such a way as to surround them with sufficient open space, and to locate them so that they do not place an unbearable burden on traffic, can we continue to build them.

AN OPEN letter in favor of state old-age pensions, sent to large employers by the American Association for Old Age Security, calls attention to a number of facts which should make a strong appeal to these gentlemen. It cites a study by Mr. Murray W. Latimer, of the Industrial Relations Counsellors, Inc., to the effect that while employers installing their own pension systems have gained no peculiar advantage from them, these systems are becoming more and more burdensome. It is true that there are fewer strikes and less labor turnover than in other years, but

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is no more true of the companies with pension plans than of their competitors. Meantime, the accumulated funds are in many cases shown to be inadequate to pay the increasing total of benefits. If payments into the fund are made adequate, they are likely to reach such a size as to be a real competitive handicap. Private pension systems are not becoming more widespread, as was formerly anticipated. In these circumstances, the question arises whether the private pension plan is not worse for individual employers themselves than a state system would be. The Association has long contended that a state system would be better for the workers. It would cover all of them, rather than a small minority. It would provide for those who, for one reason or another, have to change their employment. And it would not give individual employers the same motive which many of them now have, to refuse to hire men over forty, merely because such men would increase unduly the burden on the pension fund. That these arguments are beginning to be recognized is revealed by a questionnaire sent out by Mr. Percy A. Fellows of the Society of Industrial Engineers. Of 104 leading employers answering the question, 55 favored a scientific plan for state old-age pensions.

Hoover Plays His Part

UNTIL after the stock market crash, the Hoover administration was like a play in which the star had not yet walked upon the stage. Hidden and dumb in the shadow of the wings, the President watched Congress fumbling with the tariff, but did not desire to take an active part in the scene. The agricultural relief measure was thought to be his in conception, but, except for vetoing the debenture, he let the members of Congress speak the lines in which he had rehearsed them. His naval conferences with MacDonald were held, in spite of the blare of publicity surrounding them, in private; and so far as the spectacle was dramatized, the British Premier took the spotlight. But with the conferences of industrial leaders following the collapse of speculation, he walked on in the role for which the country was prepared by his reputation. Here was relief to be administered. Here was the coöperation of important citizens to be organized. Here was an improved technique of business control to be inaugurated. By the results of this and similar performances in the future will the political critics judge him.

To allay, as far as he could, the immediate dangers following the pricking of the speculative bubble, was a comparatively simple matter. It required the exposition of programs of building and expansion which had, for the most part, been already laid out, but which were not generally appreciated as a whole. It required eliciting promises that these programs would not be abandoned, but would as far as possible be augmented. It called for assurances that men would not be laid off and wages would not be reduced. This was mainly a task of "restoring confidence." If no serious industrial depression comes, this strategy will redound to Mr. Hoover's credit. It may be that we were not in serious danger anyway, but still the claim can be made that he averted trouble, or that he forestalled more serious trouble than occurred. The action of the President was a positive assertion of leadership in a time of crisis—something to which the nation had not been treated by its chief executive for more than eight years.

But the important part of the task to which Mr. Hoover seems to be dedicated is another matter. In spite of his former lip-service to the Coolidge regime of automatic prosperity, he understands that the lasting economic welfare of the nation requires something more than the traditional activities of individualistic business men, punctuated by inspirational conferences in time of peril. Mr. Hoover months ago called for a scientific investigation of what has been going on since the War, by the National Bureau of Economic Research, which was published under the title "Recent Economic Changes." He appointed a sponsoring committee to interpret this report and make recommendations. And while the committee was not very specific or positive, it did speak of the need for continuous examination of our affairs similar to that made in the report, and of the desirability of measures to maintain an "economic equilibrium." It is freely predicted that Mr. Hoover has in mind the creation of a permanent body which may grow into an Economic General Staff, to bring together the essential information about the trends of our economic life, and to recommend from time to time measures preserving or increasing our prosperity and permitting it to be more generally shared.

Indeed, such a development is a logical one in a highly integrated industrial world. It has been in the air of ideas ever since the War made it necessary to acquire detailed information concerning prices, production and trade, and to use this information for purposes of directing the stream of economic activity for publicly desired ends. Mr. Hoover, as one of the chief actors in this endeavor, cannot have forgotten its implications, even though temporarily he bowed to the reaction of old-fashioned "business as usual" against any type of organized control. The able economists of the British Liberal party proposed, before the recent election, such a general staff. Mr. MacDonald is reputed to have taken the first steps toward creating one. Germany, under the pressure of post-War reconstruction, has a special governmental department devoted to this activity. It is interesting that the capital-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ist nations are being slowly forced in the same general direction which Russia took as a matter of course when, in order to build a socialist state and create prosperity for the workers, she established the central economic council and drew up the famous "Gosplan."

The trend toward an ordered economic world must come; the most interesting question is, how it is to come. And it is this question which furnishes the real test of Mr. Hoover's strategy. It is highly significant that in his message to Congress, delivered at the very time when a beginning at the task is to be made, he does not mention the subject, or ask the national legislature to pass any enactments which may help to effectuate it. It is clear that in this endeavor he visualizes the role of political machinery as a distinctly subordinate one. This accords with The New Republic's analysis of his attitude during the campaign, when we pointed out that he not only recognized business as the dominant force in American life, but expected to work almost exclusively in coöperation with it. He sympathizes with the fear business men in this country have of any encroachment upon their powers, whether from the public organized as government, or from labor organized in unions, or even from scientists and experts who have no ax to grind except the general advantage. He wants these other estates to help business, both positively by sharing to a limited extent in its responsibilities, and negatively by standing out of its way when immediate interests conflict, but he encourages private business to take the lead. In the present instance, this tendency is manifested by the fact that the first step towards creating a permanent national economic staff is to be taken by the United States Chamber of Commerce, entirely unofficially, under the lead of Mr. Hoover's friend, Mr. Julius H. Barnes.

The attitude of Mr. Hoover towards business differs from that of Mr. Coolidge in that he is not merely negative and quiescent. He sees that new things need to be done. He wants to call out the latent possibilities of business for better organization. But it is traditionally Republican in that he relies upon business men to do the necessary job, without any shocks or any stimulus or any bolstering from other interests. This attitude he identifies with the old faith in a legendary "individualism." Individualism has, to him, come to mean the right and the capacity of a comparatively few business executives to direct the economic life of the nation. He seems to forget the kind of personalities developed by our business system, to overlook their general inability to see very far beyond their own noses. Or, at the least, he hopes that they will learn better. And he completely ignores the lack of any scope for the exercise of individualism on the part of the millions who, under the regime which he encourages, have nothing to do but to follow like sheep in the paths appointed for them by the active directors of business.

It is perhaps futile to quarrel with Mr. Hoover as to this general outlook. If he had been more antagonistic to the prevailing business *amour propre,* he could not have been elected President, under our present party regime. If, by some miracle, a man with a more radical tendency had been elected, he could not have made much immediate headway against the bitter opposition he would have been sure to arouse. The historical role of Mr. Hoover is apparently to try the experiment of seeing what business can do when given the steering wheel. Mr. Hoover insists that there should be a steering wheel, but he will also let business do the driving.

The outcome of this experiment will teach us much. Within a short period, it will tell the story of Mr. Hoover's political fortunes, and within a longer period, it will determine whether capitalism can survive as we know it, or must be at least modified greatly in the direction of a socialized order. We do not regard the outcome of the experiment with much hope for its success. We doubt if business alone can develop the necessary discipline over those factions within it whose immediate interest in profits makes them oppose measures which will, in the long run, be essential for the general welfare. Even if it engages the assistance of experts with enough scope and enough intelligence to recommend the desirable changes, it cannot, we believe, by persuasion only, bring all its members into line. Will employers continue to raise wages and salaries rapidly enough, and will they go on reducing prices in industries which have, at least temporarily, saturated their markets? Will they not need the pressure of organized labor in maintaining high standards of pay and hours? Will they be converted, without force from outside, to the recognition of unions? Will business, without pressure from government, be able to bring order into the unruly coal and textile industries? Will it employ conservation of natural resources, especially in cases where such conservation happens to be for the time unprofitable? Certain positive gains are to be made by the application of the Hoover policy, but sooner or later they are bound to prove inadequate. We need not only a coördinated business realm endeavoring to maintain economic equilibrium and enlarge our prosperity. We also need a strong labor movement, an authoritative body of impartial experts, a flexible and pervasive governmental control. It seems probable that the eventual choice is between such a genuine modification of capitalism from within, and a collapse which will necessitate a far more drastic change.

Mr. Hoover's modernized Republicanism is now to be on trial. Its lease of life may be short or long, but during its course it will be of first significance for the future of the nation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Resurrecting the Foreign Service

THERE is one sentence in President Hoover's Armistice Day speech which deserves more attention than it has so far received. It is the one declaring that the State Department "must be strengthened and supported as the great arm of our government dedicated to the organization of peace." At about the time when the President made this speech, Secretary Stimson personally appeared before the Budget Bureau and appealed for an increase of something like two and a half million dollars in State Department appropriations.

The Budget Bureau and Congress ought to vote this increase in appropriation. It is obvious, even to those who have only a slight acquaintance with the situation in Washington, that the State Department and the Foreign Service are seriously in need of attention and assistance. Posts are inadequately filled, while both appointments and promotions are still too much dictated by purely personal and social grounds. Resignations are frequent, and these not only in such posts as those of Minister to China and Minister to Canada, but also in more humble but also important positions.

The two outstanding needs of our State Department and Foreign Service are: first, increased financial support which will allow men without independent means to enter the service; second, a system of promotion based strictly upon merit and not at all upon favoritism. As far as our representatives abroad are concerned, the chief need is not increased salaries, but increased expense and rent allowances. Although Congress has already done something to provide adequate embassies, much more is needed. It should go without saying, that every minister and ambassador of the United States should have a house suited to his position. Further, he should receive an adequate representation allowance, thus making it possible for him to hold state functions without personal expense. The new British Ambassador to Washington, Sir Ronald Lindsay, will receive a salary of $17,500 a year, but in addition he will receive rental and representation allowances, bringing his total income to about $80,000 a year. Under the British system, therefore, it is possible for a poor man to accept an important diplomatic post. But, although the Rogers Act of 1924 authorized representation allowances, the State Department has not yet asked Congress for such an appropriation.

Many Americans assert that the payment of such large sums is undemocratic and "un-American." Others believe that it would be dangerous to convert the American Foreign Service into a professional corps; that many of our present difficulties are due to the dominance of gilded youth who lack intellectual qualifications, and who look upon the service as a social rather than a political career. The dangers of bureaucracy are easily recognizable; but an important reason why our diplomatic bureaucracy is inferior today is that no one without an independent income can afford to enter it. Our refusal to vote adequate salaries and allowances has resulted, in a large number of cases, in turning our diplomatic service over to the rich and to the incompetent. As it is now, when the President wishes to find new blood for responsible State Department or foreign posts, the best he can do is to rely upon successful bankers, business men, or corporation lawyers.

In older countries, such as England, wealthy families have developed a tradition of public service. In the United States, men of wealth have usually spent the first forty or fifty years of their lives under the shadow of big business; and when they do enter public service, they often lack the equipment and the outlook necessary for a successful public servant. In theory, at least, the journalist or the professor who has made a life-long study of politics should be better fitted for many public tasks than the successful corporation lawyer. But under our present system, he cannot afford to enter political life. Instead of being democratic, our present system is creating an artificial aristocracy—and an aristocracy which lacks the tradition of statecraft.

Increased appropriations will not in themselves, however, bring about an improvement in our Foreign Service. The increased appropriations which followed the passage of the Rogers Act of 1924 simply fattened the purses of incompetent diplomatic secretaries already in the service; they did little to bring in new blood. If young men are to be attracted to our diplomatic service, a system of promotion must be established which will recognize merit and reward it with responsibility. Many who have studied the present system are agreed that our personnel board has, in the past, been guilty of favoritism. This board has disregarded the results of the written examination, and rejected candidates because they lacked what the board regarded as the proper social pedigree, and it has failed to promote worthy men for the same reason. A new personnel board might well be created in which the permanent officials would be a small minority. The other members of the board could consist of the Under-secretary of State, a member of the Civil Service Commission and several distinguished men outside of government service who might be persuaded to come to Washington several days of the year, and who should be selected by the Secretary of State after consultation with the Senate and House Committees on Foreign Affairs. If it is necessary to have an oral examination, this should precede, rather than follow, the written examination. Then, if a candidate should be rejected after the oral test, he would be relieved of the strain of preparing for the written examination. The State Department might also follow the British and German examples of making use of university professors in the preparation and marking of examination papers. This would eliminate the present system, which is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mainly a memory test, and which many candidates pass by attending a local cramming school.

Practically all important diplomatic posts in the foreign services of some other governments are reserved for professional diplomats. Thus, the new British Ambassador to Washington, Sir Ronald Lindsay, has spent a lifetime in the British service, as has his predecessor, Sir Esme Howard. It is probably not desirable that the professional system should be followed, as far as the United States is concerned. Under the best of circumstances, a permanent official soon becomes involved in a mass of detail on the one hand, and in social trivialities on the other, with the result that he frequently loses his imagination and sense of perspective. Sooner or later, the average permanent official comes to defend the past policies of his government as a matter of course. Nothing requires less mental effort than safeguarding the *status quo*. As Professor Sidney Fay has pointed out, the career diplomats did not want war in 1914; but none of them was strong enough to cut through the bureaucratic restrictions and suspicions in which they were enmeshed—and war came. The wheels of our Diplomatic Service and our State Department should be kept oiled by skilled and experienced hands; but the men at the throttle should be drawn, periodically, from outside walks of life.

The Battle of the Styles

SINCE midsummer, a furious war of fashions has been raging on both sides of the Atlantic. The length of skirts, the breadth of hats, the location and circumference of waists, all these are subjects of dispute, but the principal question is the figure that women should present to the world—whether it is to be that of a long-stemmed Christmas tree, or that of a weeping willow with a broad crown and branches that sweep the ground. The weeping willow has more foliage—in other words, more yards of fabric and more prosperity for the textile mills. The Christmas tree is a northern evergreen—strong, hardy, free from disease. And the supporters of one and the other form the two powerful armies which are now struggling to win the adherence of women in general.

The army of the willow consists chiefly of the economic interests that will benefit by the new fashions. It consists of textile manufacturers, eager to add a yard of material to each of two hundred million dresses, and thus to create a new demand for their products. It consists of corsetmakers, or such of them as have survived the lean years since the War. It consists of dress designers in Paris, who feel that longer dresses will give more scope to their talents; and finally it consists of clothing merchants in general, who depend for their prosperity on rapidly changing styles. Skirts have been short for several years; the logic of fashion, which is the logic of change, now demands that they be long.

The opposing army is larger, but pretty thoroughly disorganized. Its leaders are the women who believe in liberty and comfort for their sex, and who are willing to fight for their beliefs. They are receiving little help from other women, the mass of whom, like the mass of men, are willing to follow fashions blindly. On the other hand, they can rely on a certain support from the manufacturers of silk stockings, whose present business is threatened by longer skirts; and they can point to medical opinion as justification for their struggle. "I think the newest fashion in women's tight-fitting dresses and corsets an unfortunate and unhealthful change," says Dr. Malcolm L. Harris, president of the American Medical Association. "The loosely clad woman has more freedom of movement . . . more endurance than the pre-War type." And a great many doctors have expressed the same judgment.

Doctors, however, have less power than dress designers and department-store buyers in struggles of this sort. The battle of fashions continues, and the weeping-willow army gains now an inch in length of skirt, now half a yard in material. Recently a Parisian designer suggested an armistice and a compromise—short dresses for street wear, long gowns for the evening—but he is only an individual, and besides, his solution is too eminently reasonable ever to be accepted in a sort of warfare which usually ends in the triumph of illogicality and unreason.

If this is the case, why treat the matter at such length? We might answer that although styles are rarely important in themselves, they often have a sort of symbolic value. Corsets, for example, symbolized the corseted and restricted position of their wearers. Hobble skirts were worn by women who were politically and socially hobbled. Comparative freedom of action for women has coincided, during the last six years, with comparative freedom in clothing. Will the new styles—the tight waists, the long skirts, the weeping-willow profile—symbolize their return to bondage? The prospect is unlikely. After all, long skirts are merely a fashion, and the essence of fashion is change.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1929, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK
HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT; DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY BRUCE BLIVEN GEORGE SOULE
EDMUND WILSON STARK YOUNG R. M. LOVETT

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JANE ADDAMS JOHN DEWEY WALDO FRANK
ALVIN JOHNSON E. C. LINDEMAN LEWIS MUMFORD
GILBERT SELDES R. G. TUGWELL LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Christian Science Censorship

JOHN V. DITTEMORE has often publicly declared that the Christian Science Church in the United States is molding or attempting to mold public opinion by coercion. Mr. Dittemore, in 1925, became the co-founder of the Christian Science Parent Church of the New Generation, as distinguished from the Christian Science Mother Church of Boston, founded by Mary Baker Eddy in 1893. Of the older organization, practically all of the Christian Science churches in the world are branches. Although his many utterances have been ignored or discounted by the Mother Church, Mr. Dittemore speaks with some authority because, for a number of years until 1919, he served as a member of the Board of Directors of the Mother Church. He is the last living person appointed to the Directorate by Mrs. Eddy. In that year, his connection was severed as the result of a disagreement concerning publications.

His assertions lend emphasis to the present fight between Christian Science (here, and after, the title applies to the Mother Church of Boston and her branches) and the publishing firm of Charles Scribner's Sons of New York, which has been going on for several months with very little attention from the press. This fight concerns a biography, "Mrs. Eddy: the Biography of a Virginal Mind," written by Edwin Franden Dakin and published August 15. The book was so thoroughly documented that it will be for years an indispensable source book for all students of Mary Baker Eddy, either as an individual of inestimable significance in American life or as the founder of Christian Science.

The object of the Church is to suppress the book. The aim of Scribner's is to keep the book on sale in all bookstores and to establish its right, as a publishing company, to print and offer to the public any book which it deems worth while. In my estimation, it is as important a war against sectarian suppression as has been thrust upon the American scene. My own position as the recorder of certain facts must be clarified. This article is not an attack upon Christian Science; any such attack must be constructed upon premises of theology and psycho-therapy with which we are not here concerned. I regard the sect as one with as much right to existence as any other. It is my contention that the Church steps beyond the periphery within which it can command the esteem of the public when it seeks to withhold or destroy factual statements regarding either its aims or leaders. If, in the course of this exposition, Christian Science is shown to be a weak church in point of numbers and powerful in point of organization, it will be, I hope, generally accepted that the Church is not being treated with asperity, but pictured as an example of the manner in which a cohesive and concerted minority can exert its will.

With the publication of Mr. Dakin's book, Scribner's became the recipient of protests and letters from such widely scattered sources and of such similarity in phraseology as to indicate a simultaneous manifestation in all sections of America of a single force. I am quoting one of the letters from Kansas City, Mo. It is the protest of a Branch Church and is of an official character. It was written over the names of the members of the Executive Board signed by the hand of the clerk. It is, of course, typical:

> There is a book on the market entitled "The Biography of a Virginal Mind," by Edwin Franden Dakin, which is published by you.
>
> We wish to protest the publication of this book on the grounds that the information contained in it is neither authentic, reliable nor true, that it is obnoxious to all Christian Scientists and misleading to the general public.
>
> We also wish to state that "The Church Manual" of the First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Mass., by Mary Baker Eddy, governs every branch Church of Christ, Scientist, throughout the world and we are one of these branches. A by-law in this manual on page 44, under the marginal heading, "Obnoxious Books," reads as follows: "A member of this church shall not patronize a publishing house or bookstore that has for sale obnoxious books."
>
> We are calling your attention to this, feeling that if you understood the circumstances you would not want to be instrumental in putting out a publication which was not true and might be detrimental to you.

An inspection of that last paragraph is revelatory. The appeal to Scribner's is not based on moral or factual issues. The withdrawal is not asked because the book is untrue or obnoxious, but because, if it is not withdrawn, the result may not be happy for Scribner's. Another church in the same city, however, was much more forthright:

> We will have to desist from patronizing your company unless the book be removed from sale.

The Church maintains in every state, and sometimes in several cities within a single state, a Committee on Publication. "It shall be the duty of the Committee . . .", "The Manual of the Mother Church" sets forth, "to correct in a Christian manner injustices done Mrs. Eddy or members of this Church by the daily press, by periodicals or circulated literature of any sort. The Committee shall be responsible for correcting or having corrected a false newspaper article which has not been replied

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to by other Scientists, or which has been forwarded to this Committee for the purpose of having him reply to it. If the correction is not promptly published by the periodical in which it is desirable that this correction shall appear, the Committee on Publication shall immediately apply for aid to the Committee on Business." The Committee on Publication may be dismissed for failure to fulfill his duties.

The Committee on Business may use any methods it deems fit. "The Manual" specifies only that "The Committee on Business . . . . shall transact promptly and efficiently such business as Mrs. Eddy, the Directors, or the Committee on Publication shall commit to it." In his book, Mr. Dakin outlines the usual custom, in the case of an obstinate editor. The Committee will find some influential advertiser who will threaten to withdraw his revenue if the correction, or article, is not printed. It would take only so much of this to get an editor to the point where he would print nothing whatever concerning Christian Science, which explains the unwillingness of newspaper executives to print what may otherwise be considered legitimate news regarding the present situation.

In the instance of a book to which loyal Scientists object, the Church learns early in the projected stage of the volume that it is being written. This is inevitable; authors must obtain material from recognized sources, and the Mother Church Board of Directors is such a source. A representative of the Church, usually the Committee on Publication in the state in which the author lives, calls upon him and suggests that the books be checked for authenticity by the Church officials. If the author does not desire to do this, the request is repeated to the publisher. If again it is ignored, the Church representatives call upon the booksellers as soon as the book goes into the stalls, and explain that it is untrue, obnoxious, lacking in authenticity, unauthorized. Page 44 of "The Church Manual" is cited, and the bookseller requested to discontinue the sale. Certain letters, however, tell the story much better:

From a Winnipeg, Canada, dealer:

> When the publicity man of the local Christian Science Church called on us regarding Dakin's "Mrs. Eddy" and stated that it was not official, was full of errors, etc., etc., we made the interview very brief when we informed him that we took our profession of bookselling quite seriously. The fact that the reliable house of Scribner's published it was sufficient guarantee to us that the book was a proper one for us to have on sale and it will be available in our store at all times for the book-buying public. We also informed him that we would be glad to sell their official life of Mrs. Eddy (or any other Christian Science literature) provided it was supplied to us at trade terms.

Another, from Chicago:

> When the biography came out I made a very large window display. Very shortly afterward, telephone calls and letters began to pour in announcing closing of accounts. I have patiently explained in each instance that, as long as the book is published by a reliable publisher and cannot be obviously classed as propaganda, I will continue selling it.

From San Francisco:

> Our attitude is not to be influenced by the position being taken by the publication office of the Christian Science Church.

This from Toledo, Ohio:

> I have already received two, or possibly three, visitations from representatives of the sect. The last one, a man, was rather offensive and it was with difficulty that I restrained my temper with him. I have sold perhaps seven or eight copies of the book and agree with you that it seems destined for a large sale this fall.

The manager of a chain of book shops wrote:

> You may depend on it that our shops are with you on the freedom of the press. We have lost customers before now because we have sold some books to which Christian Scientists objected, and I suppose we may lose some for selling this book, but that is only the misfortune of their point of view.

From Seattle:

> The picture of Mrs. Eddy on the jacket of the book, the statements about her in the book, together with the personal opinions of those who have written reviews of the biography, all plainly indicate a preconceived plan to give as bad an impression of Mrs. Eddy as possible, and in that way to discredit the teachings of Christian Science.
>
> You may be assured that so long as you insist upon literature that misrepresents Mrs. Eddy or Christian Science I shall do what I can legitimately to discourage the sale or distribution of such literature.

From a small New Hampshire town:

> We are returning to you by parcel post one only Mary Baker Eddy book as we have been requested by members of the Christian Science Church not to have it for sale.

A large department store in Atlanta:

> I am looking forward to reading "Mrs. Eddy" and I will gladly give you my opinion of its merits.
>
> I have had more than my share of sinister opposition to the book. Since they are so powerful in this town it would probably be the better part of discretion for us to withdraw it from sale.

From a large Cleveland book store:

> I am sorry that I cannot accede to your suggestion to take a more active interest in the sale of "Mrs. Eddy." We have it under the counter. It was a compromise, and in view of the fact that we have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quite a few very good patrons who are Scientists, it seemed necessary.

From a Port Orchard, Wash., individual:

I was in one of the largest department stores in Seattle, inquiring for that new book on Mrs. Eddy by Dakin which you published. They did not have it. Then I went to the largest book store in the city —the book was not on display among new books of unusual interest, but tucked away on the shelves in some inconspicuous place.

Scribner's fought back lustily. An advertising campaign that was almost national in scope was instituted. In these advertisements, the publishers declared that an attempt was being made to "smother an important book." Presumably the Mother Church Board of Directors was amazed. At any rate it is known that summonses to all Committees on Publication were sent out from Boston, and a conference was held in that city. The discussions at this conference were, of course, not made public. It is not even known that the meeting was called with Mr. Dakin's book in view. It is known that shortly thereafter the fight on the book took on added intensity. The Christian Science Sentinel, without naming either the book or the author, editorially exhorted its readers to eschew unauthorized literature and called the attention of communicants to the by-law in the "Manual" on obnoxious books.

Although newspapers generally paid no attention to the fight in their news columns, none refused to accept the advertising copy. One, the outstanding advertisement in the series, was as follows:

"We have been forced to take off our tables all copies of 'Mrs. Eddy,' by Edwin Franden Dakin."

This is from a bookseller who writes that because of pressure from individuals who are trying to smother this biography, he has been obliged to return his stock of copies and compelled to write a letter of apology to "two agencies" in his city. Personally this bookseller endorses the book.

This is a sample of many letters which have come to us from coast to coast.

The result is a situation almost incredible in a free country. You may find that your bookseller either will regret his inability to sell you this biography, universally endorsed by the press of the country, or he may produce a copy hidden away under a counter. Some booksellers actually have the courage to display the book. We hope your bookseller is one of these.

Throughout almost eighty-five years of publishing, we have been able to say of our books, "on sale at all booksellers." We regret that in this one case we must qualify this statement.

The object of the campaign, of course, is obvious. No bookseller wants to be known as lacking in courage. The advertisement is designed to stimulate inquiry, and thus the bookseller is placed in open territory between two fires, an unhappy situation. The copy was placed with the papers in Cleveland, Chicago, San Francisco and Los Angeles. It was a quarter-page in size. The letter from the Cleveland bookseller, hereinbefore quoted, was written after the appearance of the advertisement in that city. The advertisement is based upon a letter received from a bookseller in Honolulu. In the letters which he wrote to "two agencies," he apologized abjectly for having dared to stock the biography, and in his letter to Scribner's, after setting forth his action, he said that he had found the book worthy.

Recently, a Christian Science official reckoned the number of Christian Scientists in the United States at 10,000,000. The 1926 United States Church Census placed the number at 202,098. At the time these figures were made public, the Mother Church Board of Directors stated, "the number of adherents who are not members is estimated as exceeding the number who are." Church officials, however, will not furnish, or take, a census of the Church membership.

The Church, on many previous occasions, has engaged in just such a fight as is now being waged against Scribner's. In 1909, Georgine Milmine wrote a biography of Mrs. Eddy which ran serially in McClure's Magazine. It was published as a volume by Doubleday, Page and Company. After many attacks upon it, the plates and original manuscript passed into the hands of the Christian Scientists, and the book is all but extinct at the present time. It contained material that can never be duplicated. The instances in which this, or similar feats, have been accomplished are too numerous to catalogue. The best example, however, is that of "The Memoirs of Mary Baker Eddy." This book, written largely by Adam Dickey and finished by his wife after his death, was published by the Merrymount Press of Boston in 1927. For several years Dr. Dickey was secretary to Mrs. Eddy and in constant association with her. He was named a member of the Board of Directors a year or so before her death in 1910, and served until his death. A little-known letter, written by Mrs. Dickey, will show what happened:

Dear Friend: The Christian Science Board of Directors of the Mother Church, the First Church of Christ, Scientist, Boston, Mass., have requested me to discontinue the publication of the book, "Memoirs of Mary Baker Eddy," by Adam Dickey, C.S.D., and to recall all books already sold. I willingly comply with their request. Upon receipt of the copy or copies you have I will gladly return the purchase price to you.

Very sincerely yours,

LILLIAN S. DICKEY.

The reappearance recently of advertisements in several New York newspapers of "The Life of Mary Baker Eddy" by Sibyl Wilbur, recalls the fight made on Miss Milmine's biography twenty years ago. The Wilbur book was written to offset the Milmine one, was advertised and sold as the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

authentic and authorized life of Mrs. Eddy, and the advertisements reappearing recently have reasserted its authenticity. For the first time, the Christian Science Church has advertised that the Wilbur volume is on sale at all bookstores; formerly, the book was available only through the Church or its agencies. Miss Wilbur, now living in Los Angeles, has not revised her volume and it has not been altered by the Church.

The recall of the Dickey work was so effective that there are now available only a few copies. Two originals are in the Library of Congress where they were sent for copyright. Mr. Dittemore has a photostat copy of an original in the British Museum, and the New York Public Library has a photostat copy of the one in Mr. Dittemore's possession.

The entire range of possibilities in the present situation can be summed up in a single question: Will the Dakin volume go the way of Miss Milmine's biography and the remembrances of Dr. Dickey? It is not so foolish a question as may at first seem. Offhand, the answer would appear to be No, since, in this era of censorship, it is hard to imagine a book's being suppressed without recourse to the customary law agencies—such as a Brooklyn Grand Jury, or the Custom's censor. Such a course is, in this case, manifestly impossible. It must be remembered, however, that there is only one book in general circulation today that has withstood the fire of Christian Science, and that one is Mark Twain's "Christian Science." This survival may be accounted for by the fact that Twain's criticisms were hilarious. Aside from this one instance, the Committees on Publication have never failed to accomplish their purpose. It is true that they have never been fought as they are being fought now, but McClure's did put up a back-to-the-wall struggle in 1908 and 1909, and, in the eventual termination, it was a losing one.

CRAIG F. THOMPSON.

Mexico's New Leader

MEXICO, in its own peculiar way, has chosen, as did the United States, an engineer for president. Brigadier-General Pascual Ortiz Rubio also has at least one thing in common with Vice-President Curtis (Mexico has no vice-president)—Indian blood flows in his veins. His descent traces back directly to the last of the nineteen Tarascan monarchs of Michoacán, King Tzintzicha, whose son, Don Antonio, was educated by the great Spanish Viceroy Mendoz, and married off to the cream of the Colonial aristocracy. Among Ortiz's more immediate ancestors were governors, a Supreme Court magistrate, educators, militarists and an archbishop. But, unfortunately for his prestige among the Daughters of the American Revolution, he broke with the traditions of his lineage and participated in a revolution more recent than the eighteenth century.

He was born in Morelia (formerly Valladolid), capital of Michoacán, on March 10, 1877, two months before Porfirio Díaz began his long reign. There he was raised and educated, but in 1895 he was thrown out of the public preparatory school (of which his own father was principal) and arrested for participating in a manifestation against the Dictator. Young Pascual was obliged to complete his preliminary studies in a Catholic seminary. After finishing his engineering training in Mexico City, he soon became involved in new agitation in Michoacán, writing, as early as 1905, articles for the local anti-government press.

In 1910, Ortiz threw in his lot with Francisco Madero. During the troubled years that followed, he supported, not the extremists, but the sounder revolutionary leaders—first Carranza, after the assassination of Madero, then Obregon, and finally Calles, by whom he was made Ambassador to Brazil. Provisional President Portes Gil named him head of the Department of the Interior. He was on his way to take over this post when he was persuaded, instead, to run for president as candidate of the National Revolutionary party, founded by Calles when he went out of office.

Ortiz Rubio's character is simple and direct. He has much of the calm and patience and methodicalness of his Tarascan ancestry. The Tarascans are a racial enigma: like the Basques in Spain, no one knows their origin. They are generally supposed to belong to the pre-Maya, Aztec and Toltec stocks, and they have maintained their political independence against all the Nahuatl invasions from the north. It is interesting to observe how the basic military source for the stabilization of any regime in Mexico has come from well-defined Indian centers: Díaz and the Serranos of Oaxaca; Obregón and the Yaquis of Sonora; Portes Gil, Joaquín Amaro, Ortiz Rubio and the Tarascans of Michoacán.

Michoacán—one of the largest, wealthiest and most beautiful states, with its magnificent lakes and plains—bids fair to become of greater political importance than Sonora, until now the source of revolutionary governing power in the country. President Portes Gil was born in Michoacán, though his later career centers in the Gulf Coast frontier petroleum state of Tamaulipas. General Joaquín Amaro, the Secretary of War (said to be the real factor in the choice of Ortiz Rubio) is himself a pure Tarascan Indian. The election of Ortiz represents a further

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shift of political control (begun when Portes Gil was chosen) from Sonora in the north to the south and center of the Republic. An inevitable shift, for the South and Center are the real Mexico, not the warlike North, the control by which was long due to proximity to the United States and an arms supply. Amaro and Ortiz have previously coöperated in administrative capacities; and many of Amaro's army reforms were planned by Ortiz.

This brief survey gives us a hint as to some of the more basic factors involved in the elections of last month. Literally and figuratively, Mexican elections consist of many battle-fronts. The first battle-front for the recent elections was the rebellion early this year of the Valenzuela-Escobar-Topete-Manzo group of anti-Calles, intransigent Obregón military elements. Suppression of this revolt automatically eliminated two candidates—Gilberto Valenzuela and the pseudo-agrarian Antonio Villareal. The newer Calles-Amaro wing of the army was left overwhelmingly in control of the country. This elimination made possible, to a greater extent than ever before in Mexican elections, the non-participation of the army in the subsequent political campaign. Ortiz Rubio, in his *"Historia de la Revolución de 1910,"* gives a vivid picture of the earlier type of election, where the federal military authorities in the state plebiscites of Michoacán, in 1918, definitely coerced the electorate in favor of the official candidate, General Múgica, broke up Ortiz's campaign meetings and kidnapped his supporters. But in the recent campaign, the army leaned over backwards to avoid showing any partiality to either of the two leading candidates. For instance, when the local authorities in Guadalajara, at the outset of Vasconcelos' tour, broke up two of his meetings with violence, federal troops intervened and guaranteed him a hearing. Similar protection was given elsewhere, and at other times during the campaign. In spite of the fact that Ortiz is undoubtedly the favored candidate of General Amaro, the army has kept out of the campaign activities, except to fulfill its legitimate obligations to maintain order and protect whichever partisans were in danger.

Although impartiality was strictly observed by the federal authorities, the case was different with many of the state and local governments. And here, precisely, is the second battle-front of a Mexican national election—control of the state governments—which in turn control the electoral machinery. Most of the state elections were decided before either Vasconcelos or Ortiz had entered the country. But they were practically all won by the National Revolutionary party, which subsequently supported Ortiz. No state elections were won by the Anti-Reelection party, which came to support Vasconcelos. This party has had its prestige sadly weakened by the participation of its leading elements in the three unsuccessful revolts which have torn the country asunder since 1924: that of De la Huerta, that of Gomez and Serrano, and that of Valenzuela, Escobar, Manzo and Topete. Gomez and Serrano were official anti-reëlection candidates, who were openly supported by the party, even after they went into revolt. Nor have the clerical elements behind Vasconcelos been able to control any states. They, too, have the unsavory record of having disrupted the southwestern part of the country with civil war over a period of two years. These and other independent Vasconcelos elements (such as the students' and women's clubs) never became welded into any homogeneous unity sufficient to win the state elections, so essential for any successful national polling. There are, it is true, a few non-Ortiz governors, such as the peasant leader Adalberto Tejeda in Vera Cruz. The Ortiz leader in the state, Campillo Seyde, moved heaven and earth to have Tejeda ousted; but it is indicative of the moderation of the central authorities on this occasion that his efforts were unsuccessful.

The third battle-line of a national Mexican election is the Chamber of Deputies. The Chamber makes the final count, considers all election frauds, and declares the president elected. The Chamber, before the elections, had become a 100 percent Ortiz Rubio body. All Vasconcelos elements (along with the pro-Valenzuela representatives) were given the sack shortly after the March revolt on a mass charge of disloyalty. The one Communist deputy, Hernan Laborde, was also sent packing.

The fourth electoral battle-line is the struggle to control the voting booths. In Mexico, curiously enough, the government has nothing to do with the actual collecting of the votes. Theoretically, this is to avoid official imposition of candidates. The election law provides that the first five citizens who arrive at nine in the morning for the opening of the polls constitute the election board. Naturally, the best-organized and best-armed party seizes the booths. After that, the actual voting becomes unimportant. Often, when one party seizes the polling place, the rival parties open new adjacent booths. Thus Congress will have, from certain districts, the duty of examining three packages of ballots, and of deciding which came from the legal polling place. Throughout the country, the ballot boxes controlled by the Vasconcelists were stuffed with Vasconcelos votes, and those controlled by the Ortiz Rubists were stuffed with Ortiz Rubio votes. Since the National Revolutionary party controlled most of the state governments, they controlled more booths. There is no evidence that either side was particularly anxious to let its adversaries vote. However, the two rival parties, for the most part, permitted the partisans of the Communist Pedro Rodriguez Triana to vote, because this meant so many votes less to chalk up for the more feared rival candidate. The humorous but easily understood outcome has been that Rodriguez Triana will probably receive more votes throughout the country than Vasconcelos. Vasconcelos lost, in other words, because he could not weld his rather inchoate and contradictory following into a political machine which could function in a Mexican election

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as here described. It is also doubtful whether, except in certain larger centers, he had numerically sufficient following, even had the organization ability been present.

Whatever the actual practices of the election, and whatever abuses were committed by either party, more than in any previous election I have ever witnessed in Mexico, the candidates were permitted to present their views freely in public; the army, more than ever before, was out of politics. Roughly, it seems to me, the most strongly organized social forces of the country have managed to express their true will; and Vasconcelos will have done his country a great service if he establishes a tradition of sincere campaigning, unmarred by personal ambition flaring up into armed revolt.

Ortiz Rubio undoubtedly holds the sympathies of the major portion of the army. He is backed by the large majority of the various "revolutionary" organizations which supported Calles and Obregón, and which Calles welded into the National Revolutionary party. Labor and peasant support is less pronounced. The Mexican Labor party, the political wing of the "Crom" (the more conservative labor confederation) has lukewarmly supported his candidacy. This is the Labor party's first revival after the blows it received at the time of the assassination of Obregón, and subsequently at the hands of Portes Gil. For the main part, the workers and peasants, save the more radical elements who supported Rodriguez Triana, have, owing to their debilitation due to factionalism, remained in a rather neutral and non-active position. But, by and large, Ortiz Rubio represents a far more potent alignment of the existing organized social forces which pivot about the Constitution of 1917 than does Vasconcelos with his feudal alliances, his clerical connections and the inchoate sentiment of past enemies of the existing regime—an ill-defined grouping which he never effectively welded into a party. Ortiz Rubio represents the tendency toward the development of a party system; so does Rodriguez Triana; Vasconcelos, more than either of these two, represents the old-style personalism.

In general, too, Ortiz Rubio, a methodical administrator rather than an initiator of policies, represents the close of the revolutionary epoch, the crystallization of a regime based upon the liberal postulates of the 1917 Constitution of Querétaro. His personal temperament, his training, plus the psychology of the hour, would indicate that he will move further to the right than his immediate predecessors; that he will strengthen administrative control, decreasing the emphasis upon peasant and labor reform and land distribution to the peasants, and increasing the emphasis upon public works—the development of communications, road building and other constructive enterprises. He will probably swing closer to the United States (Vasconcelos launched bitter charges against our government) and will abandon the attempt begun by Calles to create a native bourgeoisie, but, nevertheless, he will hold to the existing laws regulating the investment of foreign capital, and in no sense return to the wildcat exploitation of the Díaz era. In other words, the Mexican regime has reached the middle of the road.

CARLETON BEALS.

Mexico City.

The Late Demented

MR. J. TOMPKINS RILAND of The Wopingtonian is a stout Republican on the printed page, but he has moments of personal frankness which win him the esteem of Elmer Durkin and sometimes a seven-cent cigar. On this raw November night, the journalist and the newsdealer were burning coal and tobacco in memory of the special session of Congress which had, in Elmer's brutal phrase, "kicked off in horrible agony."

"At such times," said the editor, "it is customary to speak a word of praise for the late lamented."

"Did you say, 'demented'? Well, I'll come across with a hollyhock. The Senate sure gassed the Hawley bill to death. Any stuff they pull next year couldn't be as rough as that."

"Nevertheless, it was time to retire."

"And how! Those solons were taking the rap for all the sour news on Page One. They were panned for the Wall Street blowout, and the dirt was that they invented the dry weather, long skirts and the Mediterranean fruit fly." Elmer's face wore that look of cheerful fortitude with which he ever endures the sufferings of his country's statesmen. "One more week and the whole outfit would have been indicted for bumping off Rothstein."

A new thought came to the newsdealer at this point.

"It's a funny thing that the session which started as farm relief ended up as harm relief. Listen, old thing, you've watched an awful lot of Congresses doing their stuff, did you ever lamp one that could gum itself so tight as the deceased? Deadlocked? Boy, it was padlocked! Toward the finish there was the Old Guard, the Young Guard, the Freshmen, the Young Turks, the Bush Leaguers, the Sons of the Wild Jackass and seven varieties of Democrats all moving in no direction whatever. By Armistice Day, lifelong buddies were biting holes in each other's togas."

"The party should have stood behind the President."

"Fair enough, but they couldn't find where he was parked. H. H. was against the debenture and a rooter for flexibility, but outside of that you could write your own ticket. They asked him what was what and he came out strong for Mazda lamps and the Ohio River. As far as I can crack, he didn't throw in with anybody. It's a pipe that the Chief and Moses are not as chummy as they were last year when George was running the bigotry racket. Hoover and Borah are not so Damon-and-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Jonathan, either. Did the infernal triangle, Smoot, Watson and Reed have a latchkey to Uncle Sam's Cabin? I heard different.

"Finally he got peeved and told the boys to step on it and slip him a bill a week from Thursday, but it was too late for Herbycide. All those lads could step on was their own dogs. Then, bing! came the Hoover panic!"

"Aw, Elmer, that's not fair!"

"All right, did you register a squawk when they billed it as the Hoover bull market? Whatever it was, it knocked thirty or forty billion smackers out of stock values, including eighteen dollars real money. Our prexy had his mitts full of grief now; Republican prosperity had busted right in his face. They sure slipped him a lot of new poverty to abolish. The Senate got crowded clear back to page forty-'leven among the ads for lost dogs. The only way they could get their names in the paper was to curl up and croak. So they knocked off and called it a session. That's the nicest thing it had been called for six months."

"Let's remember only the happy hours," said the gloomy editor.

Elmer loved this assignment. He picked choice blossoms out of his garden of fond memories. Of Bass Drum Shearer, of addled admirals, Security Leaguers red from ear to ear and Charley Schwab shaken with sobs. Of Babbling Brookhart and the grand old dinner party where there were Wall Streeters, silver flasks and Senators under every table. Of Joe Grundy, Nature's butter-and-egg man, and how the founding papas had pulled a boner when they let the hick states into the Union. Of Bingham caught hiring mammon to serve God. Of the November elections and horizontal Hoovercrats being carried back from old Virginny. Of Hi Johnson eating the bread of loneliness in a one-armed restaurant. Of the Mosaic wisecrack which helped so little to make us a reunited people.

"There was Moses," thus Elmer summed it up, "popular with one and all like a pain in the neck is with a giraffe, Hire'em Bingham with his halo all bashed down over his classic map and a total loss to society, Dave Reed flat with inflammatory pessimism. And Smoot—when handing 'round the loving raspberry cup, let's shoot square with Smoot. That bird was a consistent ground-loser all season. He was a bear with the backward pass.

"Jim Watson, the cheerless leader, bought him a one-way ticket to Florida and got away from it all. On the fatal fifth, every big burg in Indiana booted the G. O. P. and the K. K. K. for a flock of goals and home was no place for James.

"The Old Guard couldn't pass the bill, they couldn't pass the buck, they couldn't pass a given point. They got so crabby they couldn't even pass the time of day. I ask you, J. T., is that as butter-fingered a flock of palookas as ever fumbled a punt?"

"The New York Republicans should have honorable mention," said the sad editor.

"Amendment accepted."

"Maybe in the new session the Senate will get down to business and pass something, Elmer."

"They might at that. Ten days' layoff and a quarter of a million hand-out in mileage would pep them some. The Big Boy will have to say something when the gong rings. He can't play Old Man River forever. My hunch is that the Senators will put the skids under Vare and come Groundhog Day they will go into a huddle on the tariff and cook up a dicker. They will swap raises on factory goods for raises on farm stuff. The Old Testament game."

"What do you mean, 'Old Testament?' " Mr. Riland was kind enough to ask.

"A high for a high," said Elmer, "and a boost for a boost."

FELIX RAY.

Washington Notes

THIS is the period between the adjournment of the extra session and the opening of the regular session of Congress, and there is a certain small difficulty in the way of writing intelligently about the Hoover message, which will have been delivered before this piece is printed —the said difficulty being largely due to the fact that at this time neither I—nor, I think, anyone else—knows much of what will be in it. There was never any such difficulty about forecasting the messages to Congress of the platitudinous Coolidge, whose advocacy of the obvious was always so enthusiastically received by the bright business men whose ideal he was. With this President, however, whether you agree with his thoughts or not, it must be conceded that he has them, and it is not so easy. This being the case, it is plainly the part of wisdom to pass hastily over the forthcoming message, merely pausing to say that on form it should be the most comprehensive and important of all Hoover utterances since his election, and rush on to the political aspects of the good old Senate in the more or less immediate future.

The indications are that the coalition of Progressives and Democrats which brought about the pathetic and unprecedented collapse of the Old Guard Republican leadership, drove the unfortunate Watson to Florida before the end came, and held control of the situation, will continue during the regular session—at least as long as the tariff bill is pending. There is not, as a matter of fact, anything else for it to do. Working together, the Progressives and the Democrats have rewritten the Hawley-Smoot atrocity, reformed the bill according to their ideas, put in the debenture and struck out the flexible provision. Manifestly, they have got to go on until after the bill comes out of conference. Then a split may come. The Progressives, coming largely from the agricultural States, have a more real desire to pass a bill that will actually help the farmers than have the Democrats, a considerable number of whom have been playing for party advantage. The Democrats in both branches are somewhat apprehensive lest they should be forced to vote for the conference report and find themselves without a real excuse for not doing so. Par-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ticularly has this feeling been increased since the emergence on the Senate scene of the so-called Young Guard, composed largely of Republican Senators friendly to Mr. Hoover. Their apprehensions have been further increased by the strong probability that the Grundyesque Republican Senators of the Reed-Bingham-Moses stripe will vote against the conference report. Under these conditions it would be difficult, indeed, for the Democrats to join in killing the bill. What they really hope is that Mr. Hoover will prove unyielding on the flexible provision.

So far as the debenture plan is concerned, it is recognized that it will be traded away in the Committee. As to the rates, it is recognized that the House conferees, in the main, will accept the rates as rewritten by the coalition, these being vastly more satisfactory to Mr. Hoover than those which came originally either from the House or from the Senate Finance Committee. The real bone of contention is the flexible provision, but a form of compromise has been suggested which may be accepted. It is also hinted that Mr. Hoover may give way on this and permit the whole feature to be stricken out, content to rest on the power given him for revision under existing law. If he does not, and if there is no compromise, there will probably be no bill, because the Democrats will line up against it almost unanimously. At any rate, their opposition would be thoroughly justified by the strong case they have built up against the flexible feature, and whether the bill passes or not they will be able to make a pretty good campaign cry next fall.

Considering that there are these two elements in the Senate—the Democrats and the Old Guard Republican leaders—who would rather have no bill than the sort of limited revision measure Mr. Hoover originally recommended and the coalition has brought about, its ultimate fate is still a matter of uncertainty. The curious incongruity of these elements is interesting but not important, when the utterly different reasons for their hostility are understood. It is also interesting to see how completely it is conceded that the conference report will be accepted by the House. One reason for this conviction is recognition that there is slight possibility of a report which will be so distasteful to that body as to cause its rejection. The other is that no such coalition between Democrats and Progressives as exists in the Senate is possible in the House. The three-way Senate split seems not to be reflected there, and not to any noticeable degree in the country.

Another reason is—and this is not without its humor—that the Speaker of the House, whose Old Guard affiliations have in the past been strong enough to have him generally considered one of them, is coyly encouraging the Young Guard movement in the Senate, helping in his amiable way to inter and discredit the discomfited machine leaders in the Senate, with whom, in former days, he has labored in sympathetic harmony. The reason for this somewhat novel attitude by Longworth is not hard to understand. The "Prince of Good Fellows," for certain not altogether obscure personal as well as public reasons, is imbued with a perfectly natural desire to have the Republican party retain control of the House of Representatives. It is not his idea that coöperating with a Senate leadership which opposes every White House wish is the best way to promote that object. On the contrary, it has seemed to him that more Republican members of the House will be reelected if, in the campaign next year, they are neither under the necessity of defending the passage of a tariff bill obnoxious to the people nor compelled to apologize for the humiliating failure of the Republican party to function on this vital subject.

It seems to be rather sound reasoning. At any rate, having these ideas clearly arranged in an orderly manner back of his bald and benign brow, it is not surprising that the Speaker of the House should have been a source of comfort if not of joy, from the start of the extra session and now in the regular one about to open, to the heavily burdened figure in the White House, at present engaged in various Hooverish attempts to restore the morale of the people, so badly shattered by the recent collapse in the stock market. As to the Young Guard in the Senate, I am authoritatively informed by some of its most earnest members that it, too, will continue in the regular session. It is asserted further that it will achieve cohesion, develop leadership and have more open and recognized White House support. Thus, it seems to me that, while it is easily possible to find considerable food for amusement in the futility of the Young Guard's first efforts, and particularly in the seriousness with which some of its aspirants for leadership take themselves, nevertheless, with the backing of both President and Speaker, it is not a group to be lightly dismissed. Of the three divisions of Republicans now in the Senate, it is the largest. What it chiefly needs is a sense of direction and a sense of humor. Possibly it will acquire both in the coming months; and in any event it promises to make this a more interesting session than the last. It has at least made one thing plain—no leadership "come back" will be staged by the Watson-Reed-Moose-Bingham coterie. Those boys are out. And that is all to the good, no matter from what angle you view it—except, of course, their own angle.

Pines Are Perilous

Pines are perilous. No love is sure
  That has its place beside these harps of trees.
What hope have one man's voice and eyes
  Against the pleadings of immensities?

A house by tall pines is no one man's house,
  But all the houses that there ever were;
A wife sees through its windows all the eyes
  Of hungry lovers burning in on her.

No wonder if the husband living there
  Falls at last from words to plead his case
And knows a thousand Tristrams dead and fair
  Breathe behind the mask of his own face.

Build your house by poplars or by elms
  If you would possess a woman blind.
But eyes are beautiful through which one sees
  As through clear panes an ocean for a mind.

ROBERT P. TRISTRAM COFFIN.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Last of November

The Game of Love and Death, by Romain Rolland, translated by Eleanor Stimson Brooks. Guild Theater, November 25, 1929.

Angna Enters. The Booth Theater, November 24, 1929.

OF ALL revolutions, the French Revolution has been the most interesting to the world; more has been written and thought about it than about all the other revolutions put together. This is not only because of its violence and contrasts; it is because of the ideas emerging. From its parties and its personalities, abstractions spread; nothing happens, no figure plays a part, but that the principle involved takes the stage; because of its abstract patterns, the French Revolution has the power to draw to itself more than was concerned at the moment; it has about it the aspect of great, ideal drama. It is for this reason, precisely, that Romain Rolland's "The Game of Love and Death," among the season's plays, provides a certain high absorption and final exaltation.

This play, the second in the Theater Guild's season, comes from one of the leaders of modern literature and thought; the author of "Jean Christophe" is in himself enough to make us indebted to the Guild for producing this play. This should be said and said distinctly, because there is something about our town that makes us forget such gratitude. If a piece is a great success, we congratulate the producer; if it is less effective, we quite forget to be grateful. But the fact remains that the chance to see "The Game of Love and Death" is something to be thankful for. It is sometimes a tedious play, rising to a certain sonorous approximation of platitude, like all of Romain Rolland's writing in parts. But a good deal of its limitation, as we see it at the Guild, derives from what is not his fault.

First, there is the racial element. This writing is based on the French nature, its taste for ideas, for dialectic, for the heroic statement and method; and so is foreign to us.

There is also the fact that we are present at a translation, none too good at that, and a translation of these French sentences, and of these elaborate garments of words in which the characters' thoughts and passions are clothed, is an almost impossible matter. This is further complicated by the dramatist's evident intention of suggesting the manner of the period: his forms of speech are adapted to those forms of thought and feeling that filled the men and women of that day, toward the end of the eighteenth century, when liberty, honor, the people, the nature of God and man, were so much in the daily mind, and when passions and actions tried to mold themselves to these ideal patterns. To us it seems a far-off time indeed.

And, finally, the Guild's casting is hard on the play's prosperity. In theory, the case ought to be clear enough. Such speeches, and such modes of thought and principle—from which the speeches proceed—call for acting in which there is volume and fluency above all things. The tendency of such a play is toward declamation tempered by reality of circumstance and close sincerity of feeling. What Mr. Otto Kruger, in the role of the lover and fugitive, Vallée, brings to such lines is only platitude anyway, an obviousness in tone and meaning that is hopeless. But even within this mediocrity, Mr. Kruger would be more in the piece if he had another method, equally bad but more suited, if he ranted and sang along through his lines. As it is, some of the phrases and the constructions of the sentences—worse in the translation and poorly at home in English anyhow—obtrude appallingly as he struggles through them, intent on his effects of subjective banality. Mr. Frank Conroy is almost as bad. A certain personal dignity makes you respect him as an artist without commending him as an actor, but he belongs either in suppressed realism or in intelligent comedy; style in any formal sense leaves him only thwarted and sometimes comic.

Miss Alice Brady is a better case. She is, after all, a talented and distinct actress, she has a gift for sharp emotion and for attacking the phrase. But when, with such a variety of vocal colors, she displays a gamut of personal emotions and reactions to the motivations given the character, she merely throws things off the key. You cannot take speeches of which the soul is copious and ornate, high in tone, abstract in implication, and give them that modern realism in shading and point. The defect of Miss Brady's very excellence does as much as anything else to falsify the impression. I felt that she understood the direct emotions of her part, I thought her moving at times, and always to be respected. But in art, style is also a part of an emotion that is expressed. If you do not understand the style in which a thing is written and is to be delivered, you do not understand the thing, but only a part of it.

All this is further complicated by the fact that the dramatist himself struggles, often without success, with the problem of striking the heroic stride. He is struggling between the shadow of Racine and the modern application of the play's ideas and situation. The structure of the play, the curtains especially, seemed to me very effective theater. For the rest, I had to imagine it in French, with the added gain in speed for the delivery and in natural academics for the sentiments; and then I found myself lifted and repaid. We are more at home, as a matter of fact, with Chekhov than with a Latin work of this nature. In Chekhov, the abstract is created, but it is composed of mood and feeling. In this play of Rolland's, the abstract becomes conceptions. It is, however, the play of these conceptions, set against one another—they are constantly present—that brings "The Game of Love and Death" into the region of great art—whether it comes off or not—and dilates the mind in the finest direction that the theater can essay. It is this that, for me at least, saved the occasion from boredom.

Mr. Claude Rains gave an excellent and warmly applauded performance of Carnot, member of the Committee of Public Safety and friend of the leading character. In appearance it was crisp and perfect, a contrast to Mr. Conroy's smudgy make-up; in bearing and diction it was in the most stylized accuracy. But we should remember, in all fairness, that the role itself is far more accessible than the other leading roles in the play; its sentiments call for a delivery less different from those we commonly practise nowadays. As for the lesser parts, the acting had little connection with what was to be created—Miss Straub and Miss Fugazy, for example, had the idea to be ex-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pressed hopelessly entangled with their own natural feelings about the moment; they made the play seem sadly false and foreign.

"The Game of Love and Death" is but one play in a series dealing with the French Revolution—a polytych, he calls it—that Romain Rolland has in mind, some of them already written, some planned.

Mr. Mamoulian's directing seemed effective enough in the limited chances that the scenes provided. In the instances where a crowd was involved—the mob coming to make the arrests, for example—he showed that trait of his for something that is, I think, more a sort of theatrical liveliness than impressive art.

Miss Aline Bernstein's setting, a salon of the period, in a sort of green gray, with gold, was beautiful and quite right.

Miss Enters

The programs of Miss Angna Enters have long since been reviewed in these columns, but it seems hardly fair now not to say that her new season has begun with an added security of movement, and that her witty statement and clear drawing have lost nothing. She has some new numbers, of which the better part are still waiting to be set, to come into their permanent form and meaning. But she remains one of the most individual talents in our theater, curiously bold and clear, free of influences foreign to her nature, whether good or bad, as the numbers proceed, always entertaining, always notable for her drawing, which is like that of modern painting, always witty, and sometimes, as in "The Queen of Heaven" or the "Moyen Age," beautiful, profoundly inventive and never to be forgotten.

Stark Young.

Maurice Ravel

NOT even at the time when his "Miroirs" succeeded Debussy's "Images," and his "Rhapsodie Espagnole" the magician's "Iberia," was it discriminative to see the mere follower in Ravel. The Chotzinoffs of the period did say of his work, "It's by Ravel, therefore it's like Debussy," while solicitous fellow-composers foresaw the future's label of "school of" upon his sober pieces. But the fact was, that from the very first, Ravel's exquisite, detached and ironic art had a profile. True, the composer commenced as a musical symbolist; and musical symbolism was Debussy, its most richly gifted representative, to the degree that late adherents of the movement perforce appeared his disciples. Still, the group as a whole flowed directly from Wagner. Several of its strongest characteristics: its responsiveness to the latent, the mysterious and the infinite, its delicate pantheism and expression of the correspondences between the human psyche and the life of things, and its excessively idiomatic use of orchestral timbres, figured in "Tristan," the "Ring" and "Parsifal." And Ravel was as legitimately in the Wagnerian succession as Debussy himself or any other man of his generation.

To be sure, Ravel's music, when it appeared, did exhibit the dominance of the harmonic over the melodic element, the consecutive ninths and sevenths, and the successive chords blent by the pedal, so very typical of Debussy before Ravel commenced to compose. But so, too, did the pieces of the veteran Fauré, and those of Charles Martin Loeffler, Cyril Scott and the coeval rest of the musical symbolists. The traits were common property of the movement, and not Debussy's own. And, while perhaps no other of the group approximated the noble reserve and penetrating sensuality of Debussy's style, and the preciosity and incertitude of his spirit, as closely as our musician in "Oiseaux Tristes," Une Barque sur l'Ocean" and "Le Gibet," the parallelism has the persistent temper of the French people, and the pervasive one of a period, to legitimatize it. Particularly, in view of the circumstances that the resemblances are very superficial, and that, essentially, the two bodies of work are almost antithetical. Ravel's style, from the very commencement, had much more of classic rigidity than Debussy's excessively fluid, arabesque one. His preference for the classic structures over those developed out of the ideas and themes themselves, was promptly announced by his "Sonatine." And, whereas the older man's art was markedly lyrical and tender, that of the younger was more largely given to witticism and irony. It has been justly said that Debussy was a sensuality and sensibility; Ravel, a sensuality and a sense of the ridiculous.

No, the composer had a decided individuality even before he broke with symbolism. But if it was rash, then, to deny it, how much more rash is it today to allow it an intense significance, or to pretend finding a strong impulse in his music! And yet it has become almost genteel today to place Ravel in the front rank of French composers. Even before the death of Debussy, and before the new esthetic had replaced his *fin de siècle* one, people were finding "Daphnis et Chloe" and its kin superior to the tribe of "Pelléas," for example. Ravel was not only the man who waded in while Debussy stood upon the bank, they said. He was the better artist. These judges must have been counting vague futurities when they spoke, for a critical comparison, upon musical grounds, of the work produced by the two men up to 1916, the year Debussy died, is not decisively favorable to Ravel. Let it be admitted, right away, that the Ravel string quartet is as impeccable a piece of musical jewelry as that of Debussy is indifferent. Let it also be admitted that the "Sonatine," and the three pieces called "Gaspard de la Nuit"—especially the last one, "Scarbo"—constitute as magnificent a contribution to piano literature as any Debussy made. And let it be granted that Ravel's rhythms are frequently more piquant than the older man's. It still remains incontrovertible that Ravel's failures are more numerous than Debussy's. Debussy's work may not always be profoundly inspired. But Ravel's is sometimes not inspired at all. Of the three orchestral songs entitled "Scheherazade," only the second contains what might be called a musical idea. The "Introduction and Allegro" for harp has an almost Mendelssohnian slickness. Not only are Debussy's ideas and themes more pregnant than Ravel's. They are more strictly original. While Debussy is occasionally reminiscent of Moussorgsky, he never reaches the degree of indebtedness of Ravel to Rimsky-Korsakov for the rhythm of the bacchanale in "Daphnis." Indeed, Ravel's idiom is not a little mixed, having had affinities with Viennese melody, probably long before "La Valse" was conceived. It also, witness in "Ondine," adulterates the folksong-like simplicity of sym-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bolist music with a generous measure of Lisztian floridity. As for Ravel being the man who wades in and Debussy the dreamer on the bank, that claim is disposed of by the presence of a strain of prettiness in the music of the pretended agent.

Nor have the recent developments in Ravel's art materially increased its significance. Symbolism passed from the center of the scene with the War, succeeded by a dryer, harder, disabused feeling expressing itself in severer, less lyrical, accents, brusquer rhythms and forms more architectural than pictorial. In Ravel, as in Stravinsky, the change manifested itself, among others, in a growing tendency to take the works of former composers as points of departure; to sit, as it were, before these compositions analyzing them, and then construct the findings into edifices satisfactory to his own state of mind. Were Ravel's and Stravinsky's medium that of words, this process would be termed criticism. Stravinsky's "Oedipus Rex" would be called a criticism of Händel, his "Apollon Musagetes," a criticism of the gallant ballets of Versailles, his "Baiser de la Fée," a criticism of the early, politer Tschaikowsky. And Ravel's "Trio" would constitute a comment on Saint-Saëns, "Valses Nobles et Sentimentales" a comment on the Wienerwald Schubert, "La Valse" a study of Johann Strauss, the slow movement of the violin and piano sonata a study of the Blues, "Tzigane" one of gipsy music and the "Boléro" one of a popular Spanish dance. And, no doubt, Ravel has brought off a number of fascinating toys by means of this novel process. "La Valse" and the "Boléro" are consummately able bits of work. Ravel's craftsmanship, like that of all of Fauré's pupils, has always been distinguished, and it has grown with the years. When one considers that the twenty-minute long "Boléro" is constructed on a single rhythmic figure incessantly repeated, the unflagging interest of the crass, cigar-box colored piece seems well-nigh miraculous. The transparency of the richly conceived and orchestrated waltz is equally wonderful. None the less, these pieces are toys for a discouraged world. They are most grateful to the sensual ear, amusing it with exquisite combinations of timbres, and smooth conducts of piquant sound. But they want spirit and enthusiasm as much as they want vivid ideas, developments and contrasts.

They are all ironisms. In the past, Ravel's approach to his material, his feelings and medium, tended to obliquity. An attitude of superiority to his feelings and condescension to his medium, very bland, very urbane, but still immoveable, was apparent. There is far more adult complacency in the very delightful "Ma Mère l'Oye" than in Debussy's touching "Children's Corner." But of late Ravel's approach is little besides indirect. The frankly sarcastic "Histoires Naturelles" are now anything but singular among his works. "Valses Nobles et Sentimentales" is the music of one who stands outside the dance in smiling acidulous detachment, observing it; and "La Valse" gives the very warm, very sensual, very joyous idiom of "The Beautiful Blue Danube" a cold, almost demonic twist.

Nor can one help observing in sizing up Ravel's impulsion, that what attracted the young musician to Spanish music in the days of the "Rhapsodie Espagnole" was its torpor; and that, again and again, in both the "Valses Nobles" and the orchestral waltz, the music has a languidness and downwardness occasionally fired and lifted as by an inspiration and ravishment which swiftly dwindle again and let it sink.

At that, Ravel may still be what his partisans call him, the ablest of living French composers. There is no question of the independence of his spirit. Within the limits imposed on him, he has remained experimental and inventive, never seeking orginality in the ways of license. His art is a beautifully logical one. If he belongs in the exquisite tradition in which he began, even when, as in "Tzigane" and the "Boléro," he strives to write vulgar music, he has never, like so many of his coevals, mistaken brutality for strength. He is an original harmonist, a gifted orchestrator; witness the simple and savory combination of trumpet and celesta in the "Boléro." Assuredly, he has many close competitors. But while the music of d'Indy and Schmitt, Roussel and Milhaud, is more virile than his, more ambitious and powerful, it is scarcely as complete. Ravel may not have written pages as lofty as those of d'Indy, where the loftiness is spontaneous and not willed, but neither has he ever pretended to an altitude and gravity that are not naturally his; and it is doubtful whether any of his major works will wear as badly as d'Indy's "Jour d'Eté sur la Montagne" is commencing to do. Though his music wants the warmth and smoulder of the best of Schmitt, say the first part of "La Tragédie de Salomé," it also never descends to the bombast of the finale of that work. It is always well-bred. Roussel and Milhaud may conceivably surpass it, but neither has, so far; and Milhaud remains disquietingly unself-critical, and curiously nostalgic in temper.

No, Ravel remains the best workman current French music has to show. He is one of his country's *petits maîtres,* one of her Coypels, Lancrets, Paters, captors of some spirit of grace, fixers of ravishing bits of color, of rare and improbable harmonies destined to delight generations. Among musicians, his place is presumably with Mendelssohn, Saint-Saëns and the other charming musicians, smooth melodists, clean workmen, recorders of bits of experience, not always general in character, in elegant and transparent forms. But Beethoven and Mozart and Wagner and the rest of the composers impelled to release big forms embodying universal experiences and feelings about the whole of life, were, needless to remark, something besides charming musicians. They were great spirits, too.

PAUL ROSENFELD.

Raison d'Etre

Of little consequence, to this quick pleasure,
  Are war and love; and suffering may be noted
But briefly, to be wept about at leisure;
  But now, full-throated,

Let life, like song, mount on these sharpened instants
  To flame-point meaning, to a spear of feeling. . .
On the horizon, peace; and in the distance
  A bell pealing;

And overhead one branch curved under heaven;
  And the heart suddenly knows, with no word spoken,
For this the pain was borne, the pledge was given,
  And the mold was broken.

DOROTHY REID.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

The McNamara Case

SIR: I am writing a history of the McNamara case which followed the blowing up of The Los Angeles Times in 1910, and should like to get in touch with anyone who has an intelligent idea about the affair and its implications. My address is P. O. Box 966, San Pedro, Cal.

San Pedro, Cal. LOUIS ADAMIC.

President Arthur's Letters

SIR: I am preparing a biography of Chester A. Arthur and seek assistance in locating letters written by him.

Persons who have letters written by General Arthur at any stage of his career are urged to notify me, stating to whom they were addressed and the date of writing. Letters loaned to me will be promptly copied and returned. All such assistance will be acknowledged in the book. GEORGE FREDERICK HOWE.

University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.

Our Expensive Waterways

SIR: The New Republic, in commenting on the report of the Institute of Economics on the proposed St. Lawrence waterway, said:

> If this study cannot be upset by an equally careful and disinterested one, Mr. Hoover will have to make a difficult decision. He may feel that his commitments and his reputation as an economist require sticking to his guns. His natural combativeness may induce him to try to see it through. But we believe that his reputation would gain more in the long run by an admission that he has been wrong. For the true sign of the scientific spirit is not so much to be always right as to be willing to learn even unpleasant truths from conscientious analysis of the facts.

Mr. Hoover, in his speeches celebrating the completion of the improved Ohio River waterway, has plainly chosen the path of "sticking to his guns," and has given the public to understand that the disturbing findings of the Moulton report are not troubling him. In his speech at Louisville on October 23, he said:

> I may say that I have seen a statement published lately that this improvement would cost such a huge sum as to make it entirely uneconomical and prohibitive. To that I may answer that, after we have disposed of the electrical power, we could contract the entire construction for less than $200,000,000, divided between the two governments and spread over a period of ten years.

The $200,000,000 estimate set by Mr. Hoover does not differ sufficiently from the $257,000,000 figure of the Institute of Economics for the river work proper to invalidate the finding that, after the cost of harbor work is included, total costs of transporting grain by the St. Lawrence waterway would be some 50 percent greater than by the present combined rail-and-water route.

Similar, or even more cogent, and equally unanswerable economic objections may be adduced regarding the extensive improvement in progress or projected on our other inland waterways. But, says Mr. Hoover, what the American people desire "is action, not argument," and he is moving in his efficient manner to ignore his objectors and confound them by hurrying his projects to an early completion.

Is this the approach to problems of national economy which the American people should expect from a Chief Executive who was to bring the mind of the engineer and the cool intellect of the scientist to the solution of public questions?

New York City. GARNETT LYNE.

Youth Will Speak for Itself

SIR: On December 7 and 8 a conference will be held at the Rand School of Social Science, 7 East Fifteenth Street, New York City, on the Youth Movement, sponsored by the Young Circle League of the Workmen's Circle, the Young People's Socialist League and the Rand School. This gathering has been designed to give the young people a chance to speak for themselves. Among the speakers will be a very few adult leaders, but nearly all of the discussion will be carried on by persons under the age of twenty-five. The public is invited. Sessions will open at three o'clock on the seventh and at eleven on the eighth.

WILLIAM E. BOHN,
New York City Educational Director.

The Conscription of Wealth

SIR: Duff Gilfond, in "The New Conscription" (The New Republic, September 25), apparently accepts the statements of Past Commander Spafford of the American Legion that the conscription of wealth for war expenses is impossible, being forbidden by the Constitution. While it is far better to assume that the Kellogg Pact renouncing war will be observed than to make plans for future wars as if there were no such covenant, nevertheless the truth regarding the conscription of wealth should be made clear.

In principle no one who upholds the drafting of men for the job of killing fellow men can object, with any show of reason or decency, to the drafting of wealth to foot the bills. "Any future policy of conscription should be inclusive, applicable in terms to the entire personnel and the entire wealth of the whole nation," said President Coolidge in an address at Kansas City in 1926. But he did not state how it could or should be done. Duff Gilfond is sure that it would not be effected by the Capper-Johnson Bill.

The fact is that the conscription of wealth for war-costs raises no constitutional question, requires no abandonment of democracy in favor of dictatorship, no fixing of prices by dollar-a-year men. One simple measure will avail: Let war be paid for by taxation rather than by borrowing. Let tax receipts take the place of bonds in time of war. Government would thus show no more tenderness to property than to human life.

It is the almost universally accepted theory that by means of bond issues the burden of paying for a war is passed on to future years, perhaps generations. This is sheer nonsense, since an army cannot be fed on wheat that will grow thirty years, or even one year, in the future. The economic reality of the matter and the actual working of the bond system are clearly set forth by a high authority, none other than Secretary Mellon, who said in 1924:

> The question of how rapidly the public debt shall be liquidated is not a question of what proportion of the cost of the war shall be shifted to future generations. A domestic debt is simply a liability of the people to pay the group holding government securities. From the viewpoint of the country as a whole the war was paid for when it was fought. The equipment, munitions, food, clothing and all other materials and supplies necessary for carrying on the war had to be produced before they could be utilized. If the war had been financed entirely through taxation, as some suggested at the time, or the supplies needed by the government had simply been commandeered and not paid for, it can readily be seen that the whole burden of the war would have been borne at that time . . . The financing of the conflict in part by loans was simply an arrangement under government supervision whereby those who were in position to do so could pay more than their proper proportion of the cost and be reimbursed later with interest by those who were not in a position at that time to meet their proper proportion under the tax system without too great sacrifices and hardships. What constitutes an asset to the one group in the form of government obligations is in effect an equal liability on the other group in the form of a tax lien on their future earnings. The government is simply an intermediary or agent who collects from the debtor and pays the creditor.

Mr. Mellon thus justifies war bonds as affording temporary relief to those unable at the time to pay their "proper proportion" of war expenses, while giving such persons the privilege for the rest of their lives of making good the deficiency when they pay their taxes. His statement of what actually occurs when bonds are issued cannot be questioned. But one may question this very rich man's opinion, so frankly expressed, that the process

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he describes distributes the burden of war costs in the "proper proportion" as between the richer and the poorer classes. Those who buy bonds do it presumably "without too great sacrifices and hardships," as it is voluntary. Suppose the same amount were collected by taxation, not from the poor, but from those very bond-buyers and others of like means who might have shirked their "patriotic duty" to buy. In this way the poorer class would be relieved not merely for the time, but permanently. And would the richer class be paying more than its "proper proportion"? I trow not. The poorer people provide most of the cannon fodder. Let the well-to-do, those who have the means which would enable them to buy bonds, pay the war bills. In other words, instead of issuing bonds, let the government issue only tax receipts. This would be the conscription of wealth, a legal and practicable procedure, as well as reasonable and just, the adoption of which would be forced by public opinion if the public once understood the operation of war bonds as Mr. Mellon has explained it. If such a policy should be enacted into law, our country would not engage in war again.

Newton Centre, Mass. HENRY W. PINKHAM.

The Athens Peace Conference

SIR: The work of the Twenty-seventh International Congress of Peace, which opened its deliberation on October 6, is now completed. It took place in the capitol of the Greek Republic with the distinction of holding its first session in the chambers of the Hellenic Boule (Greek Parliament), and its last at Delphi. Under the presidency of M. Alexander Papanastasiou, former Prime Minister of Greece, the delegates of the Congress discussed the practical aspects of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, the question of arbitration, the possible confederation of Europe, and other timely topics on problems of minorities and reparations.

It is strange, however, to note that the American press which devotes so much space to subjects of international peace, has this time failed to inform the American public of the plans and deliberations of the above-mentioned Congress. What is more surprising, several peace societies to which the writer applied for information had little or no information about the International Peace Congress that met at Athens.

From all appearances, this Congress should be considered as a significant international event in promotion of world peace. M. La Fontain, the Vice-President of the Belgian Senate, who acted as chairman of the Congress, declared with the close of the work: "We depart from Athens with the best of impressions, and with the conviction that idea of world peace has been strengthened." It was the first time that this Congress of Peace had met in Eastern Europe. And it is of special interest that it met in Athens. Wars in the Balkans and the Near East have been considered as chronic. Yet, since the War, the idea of peace has been taking root in the national mind of the most progressive states in this part of the world. Doubtless the deliberations of the recent Congress will further stimulate this movement. As a matter of fact, we read in the Greek press that steps are being taken to organize a Balkan Peace Congress which will meet in 1930, at Athens. This Congress will represent all the States in the Balkan Peninsula, including Turkey.

With regard to Greece, the question of peace is now a well defined national policy. Eleutherios Venizelos, the Prime Minister of Greece, since coming back to power a year ago, has made weighty and frank declarations on the subject of peace. He returned from his recent European visit in time to address the Congress and reassure the world of his earnest efforts for peace. The comments of the Greek press with regard to the meeting of the International Peace Congress in Athens reflect the sentiment of the Greek people who are now actively engaged in favor of permanent peace. Evidential are the following fates, as given to me by The North American Committee of Friendship and Coöperation with Greece. Not long ago the Board of Education in Greece initiated an essay contest in all Greek schools on the topic of world peace; the schools have also been requested to add to their curriculum courses which would deal with international relations with emphasis on world peace; perhaps even more significant is the fact that the Greek text books have been submitted to a close examination in order to eradicate all passages tending to create animosity toward other nations.

It was in such an atmosphere that the delegates of the International Peace Congress found hospitality in Athens. They have left for Constantinople, Sofia, Belgrade and Bucharest to prepare the ground for a Balkan Confederacy, and come in touch with the phil-pacific elements in these capitals. Symbolic was the action of the Greek government in building a light-house on top of Mount Lycabettos, which was illuminated during the meeting of the recent Congress, and will henceforth be lighted during the sessions of the League of Nations.

CHARILAOS LAGOUDAKIS.

New York City.

The New Mexican Labor Code

SIR: In The New Republic of October 16, editorial reference is made to the labor legislation under consideration in Mexico. With your customary liberal ardor, you commend the new code as one that will do much toward improving conditions. May I point out that when a man has appendicitis, he does not have his teeth extracted—even if they are in poor shape—until after his appendix is removed? To pass labor laws in Mexico of an advanced character as long as that country remains politically in a state of chaos is an analogous absurdity.

Mexico, today, is burdened with a large parasitic population. Any attempt to improve the condition of labor, in my opinion, must provide for the absorption of that population into industry and for the extermination of militarism and banditry. These ends the labor code is not designed to accomplish. Where will Mexico put the workers that will be thrown out of employment when higher labor costs make greater mechanization imperative?

Its manufacturing industries do not exist. Its agriculture struggles along, overwhelmed by each successive revolution. Only mining is on a stable basis. From its mines come Mexico's principal products. But the market within its own borders is not commensurate with production, so that a tariff to stimulate output would be useless. Its minerals and metals must be sold in the world market and at the world price. Already, the markets are swamped with oil. Silver has been declining steadily in price for the last year. Lead and zinc deposits of vast extent are being found in Canada and Australia, and these countries will be able to meet any increase in demand more cheaply than can Mexico. Of none of these minerals—silver possibly excepted—does Mexico produce a sufficient quantity seriously to affect world markets.

Many of the old mines are being exhausted. When they close down, the miners will have to seek employment elsewhere. New mines would offer the logical opportunities for this work, but few new mines are being developed. Metal prices are too low, political conditions too unsettled, hazards of transportation too great and taxes too high to encourage prospecting. American and British investors, who control the Mexican mining industry, are not anxious to sink new money into this country when the possibilities of profit are so great in Canada, Rhodesia and Australia. And capital can't be prevented from transferring itself whither it will, no matter what the humanitarian inducements of other industries and other climes may be. The threats to which you made reference in the editorial were not idle ones, even if they were reprehensible from an international standpoint.

Do not assume that I am a reactionary, that I approve of the exploitation of labor and that I clap my hands with glee at the disgusting spectacles now almost a daily occurrence in our own South. From your editorial, it would seem that you desire for Mexico a prosperous and what we please to call a civilized career, with all its peoples deriving some benefit from its general prosperity. To me it seems that this end cannot be accomplished without the disappearance of militarism and the spread of education. Agriculture must be fostered and the rights of the peasant, which have been forgotten even in the labor code, maintained. None of these ends, it seems to me, would be fostered by the new labor code. Instead I think it is dangerously close to being a mere sop, provided for the amusement of the populace by a group of politicians anxious to maintain their positions. Certain provisions, such as the elimination of the confusing and unneces-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sarily divergent state labor laws, can well be adopted at this time, but as a whole, without a violent revolution in the character and the attitude of Mexico's leaders, I cannot consider its new labor code with anything but misgiving.

New York City. S. D. STRAUSS.

The Meerut Trial

SIR: On my recent return to the United States from British Guiana, I was thankful to find your editorial on the Meerut Trial, in India, and the strong appeal that you made with it. The Indian police system—with its ubiquitous C. I. D.—is peculiarly open to corruption and also to the employment of cruel methods of punishing prisoners. During the non-coöperation movement of 1921 and 1922, when thousands of young students and others went joyfully to prison, the stories that they brought back, both concerning their own experiences and also concerning what they saw, were often heart-rending. One or two government commissions made inquiry; and even their very carefully guarded reports revealed a condition of things that was shocking to humanity. On many occasions, I have been called upon to take up the cause of political prisoners in order to obtain their release. The treatment of one of these, whose release was granted, was so indescribably bad that the details were entirely unprintable. What he told me, only confirmed a hint given me by one of the secretaries of state who had an inner knowledge of the facts.

Things in India have been accentuated because of the corruption that is present in the jails. If a prisoner is able to tap money resources, he is able to obtain indulgences; but this necessitates (as its direct corollary) that those who are either too honest or too poor to engage in such corrupt practices get even harsher treatment because of their refusal or inability to bribe.

This whole Indian jail system has inherited medieval methods which have not yet been eradicated by continual exposure. These crop up again and again in times of political panic. It was my duty to investigate what went on in the prisons and outside them under martial law, during the dark days that followed the Amritsar shooting of 1919. It was then that I looked into a depth of misery, suffering and humiliation that I had never believed possible or conceivable.

It must be remembered that ever since the Reforms of 1919-1921 (as also before them) police administration has been strictly kept as a "reserved" subject and has never been "transferred" to elected representatives of the Indian people for control. Along with the Army, it has been rigidly reserved in the hands of the rulers of India, who are thus directly responsible for all that happens. The late Mr. Mackarness, many years ago, took up the cause of the Indian prisoners in the House of Commons, and endured much hostile criticism by exposing instances of torture. He died in the midst of his great work, and no one has taken it up since with the same earnestness of inner conviction. A successor is badly needed.

It is not sufficient to say, in palliation of what is happening, that in some of the Indian feudatory states, and also in other Eastern countries, things are either as bad or worse; because here, in what is called "British" India, Great Britain and ultimately the British Parliament are solely responsible.

I would wish, if possible, to lift this question clear out of politics and treat it purely as a humanitarian issue. Every human government fails in its duty, from time to time, and the only way to help that government is to bring to light the evil before the world court of public opinion. With the facts before us of the Meerut prisoners, combined with the death on the sixty-third day of hunger strike of the young student Jatindranath Das, and other similar events, it is surely time that the humanitarian verdict of the world were brought to bear to prevent things going further. No one could be a more humane man than the present Viceroy of India. It is impossible, also, to believe that Premier Ramsay MacDonald can willingly countenance these things. What is needed is to show clearly that the best opinion of the world is seriously alarmed and eager to hear the news that the system which has produced these evils will be drastically reformed.

C. F. ANDREWS.

New York City.

Is Prohibition a Protestant Principle?

SIR: Mr. Callahan's reference, in a letter published in the October 16 issue of The New Republic, to the prohibitory laws and requirements of the Catholic Church, brings forward certain thoughts that have been in the back of my head for a long time.

Is it not true that those who oppose the Eighteenth Amendment today are following a real Protestant tradition, while those who favor prohibition are in effect adhering to the Catholic principle? Is it not true, whatever they themselves may think about it, that the anti-Volsteadians are treading in the footprints of liberty-loving, free-thinking men and women of the past who wiped away the many inhibitions, prohibitions and taboos to which the Christian world had submitted up to the sixteenth century?

Protestants have been fond of declaring that from the very beginning their system of religion has stood for freedom from petty restraints and restrictions, fast and abstinence, and the like. Protestantism, with some few exceptions here and there, has played up freedom of conscience and conduct as against that policy which its leaders declared to be the interference of the Catholic Church in the life of the individual Christian. The great revolt of the sixteenth century—how has that been presented by Protestant leaders ever since, but as the uprising of the common people against the chains (prohibitions) which during the dark ages had been gradually wound about them by the Catholic Church?

Prohibition of liquor is on all fours with other prohibitions, and it is not a Protestant principle. It belongs to that Church in which so many other prohibitory and restrictive laws still find a natural home.

Catholics submit gracefully, even in these days, to such things as prohibition of meat on Fridays and fast days, the prohibition of certain forms of amusement in Lent and Advent, the prohibition of marriage to men and women in religious orders, the prohibition of marriage among the laity within certain degrees of kindred, the prohibition of divorce, the prohibition of birth control (as commonly understood), the prohibition (wherever possible) of marriage between Catholics and persons of other faiths, the prohibition of joining or establishing oath-bound secret societies, the prohibition of reading certain books, the prohibition of freedom with regard to attending Mass on Sundays and holidays throughout the year, the prohibition of taking part in any other religious services save those of the Church itself, the prohibition of the use of the public schools where Catholic schools are available, the prohibition of cremation (in ordinary cases), and finally the prohibition of being buried in a non-Catholic cemetery. Literally from the cradle to the grave, the Catholic is, in all these matters and maybe more, subject to prohibitions and restrictions from which the Protestant is free. Is it not true, therefore, that prohibition is very much more in accord with the obedient and very much disciplined Catholic spirit than with the individual assertiveness and freedom from regulation of Protestantism?

It is a topsy-turvy world indeed in which we find Protestantism today fighting on the side of prohibition, while Catholics, by whom prohibitions and restrictions and regulations in other matters are so readily accepted, are identified so largely with opposition to it.

Boston, Mass. THOMAS ADDIS TONE.

The Cleveland Plan

SIR: I call your attention to the statement in your comments on the Cleveland election in a recent issue, which reads:

> The Cleveland plan is undoubtedly weaker than that of Cincinnati, in that the southern Ohio city provided for a council of nine elected at large by proportional representation, while Cleveland set up a council of twenty-five elected by districts.

I think this should read "while Cleveland set up a council of twenty-five also elected by proportional representation but by districts." As the statement appeared in your columns, those uninformed about the Cleveland situation might assume that P. R. is not a feature of the Cleveland plan.

Cleveland, Ohio. C. K. MATSON.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Presidential Timber

An Epoch and a Man: Martin Van Buren and His Times, by Denis Tilden Lynch. New York: Horace Liveright. 566 pages. $5.

Polk: The Diary of a President. Edited by Allan Nevins. New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 412 pages. $5.

IN THE process of exhumation for the entertainment and enlightenment of the reading public, the resurrection men have got down to Martin Van Buren and James K. Polk. To most of us, these gentlemen have been merely typical of the stratum of American Presidents deposited by the wash of politics in the second generation of our national history. There is indeed a difference, progressively more emphatic, between the first seven, Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, J. Q. Adams and Jackson, and the second group, Van Buren, Harrison, Tyler, Polk, Taylor, Fillmore, Pierce and Buchanan. To contemporaries, the change in character of the men who filled the office of chief magistrate, and, in consequence, of the office itself, seemed to have been initiated by Jackson, the first President who did not belong to the patrician and intellectual class, but Jackson represented one phase of the revolution, the proletarian, and was in the logical sequence from Jefferson. Moreover, he administered his office in the tradition of the great Presidents, with a policy of his own, which set him in important issues above the politics of opportunism and expediency. Van Buren noted a difference between himself and his predecessors when he remarked in his inaugural address that he was the first President to be born under the flag of the United States. He was the first who could not appeal to the country on his war record, or as a founder of the Constitution, who owed his elevation to his mastery of the political machinery which had developed under that instrument. It is a commonplace of the second period of American history that men of commanding ability, who might have been chosen by an impartial arbitrator, invariably failed of attaining the presidency. It is to be said for Mr. Lynch's biography that he makes out a strong case for Van Buren as one of those best fitted for the office, judged by the evidence of his single term; and, in his failure to secure a second, as joining Clay and Webster among the martyrs to the sacred principle of availability. Mr. Lynch makes us consider whether, after all, Van Buren does not belong with his predecessors as the upholder of the tradition of a strong and able administration, whether the beginning of the fatal declivity which led to civil war should not date from 1840, with the unfortunate election of Harrison and Tyler. In regard to Polk we feel no such doubt. He writes himself down as mediocrity incarnate; but at that he comes off well in comparison with the feeble Presidents who succeeded him.

Martin Van Buren may be called a transition figure. He was a plebeian, like Jackson, without education, except in the adult school of professional practice and politics. He was of a strain alien to the Anglo-Saxon, the Dutch, as Jackson was Scotch-Irish. Yet he became a national leader, commanding a measure of popular enthusiasm and devotion throughout the country equaled only by Clay. In his long life he spanned the entire period between the administrations of Washington and Lincoln. He began his career when the Clintons and Livingstones controlled New York, and the Virginia dynasty ruled the country. He went to Monticello for instruction. He knew Burr, Elbridge Gerry, Rufus King, the Van Rensselaers and other secondary figures of the Revolution. He saw the birth of Tammany Hall. He was the friend and rival of the leaders of the middle period, and the teacher of the generation which followed. Charles Francis Adams was his running mate in the campaign of 1848, and Samuel J. Tilden his last political intimate. The weight of association places him with these men rather than with the mediocrities who succeeded him in the presidency. As Secretary of State, Minister to Great Britain and President, he played a salutary part in the foreign policy of the time, of which the chief objective was to consolidate the hegemony of the United States on the American continent, and avoid collision with European powers such as had resulted in the War of 1812. He was the defender of the sound-money policy, and author of the method of controlling national finance through the sub-treasury. He was the upholder of the Union, and when the slavery question began to threaten its existence, he swung out boldly against the dictation of the South in the matter of the annexation of Texas and the introduction of slavery into the territories. Yet his name is remembered in connection with the development of the machinery of American politics, the regimentation of voters and their representatives, the control by the boss, the campaign of intrigue and indirection, the spoils system. It is true, he was the originator or the perfecter of these devices. It is also true that they were all turned against him in the end by the pupils whom he had taught, and that he lived to justify the warning: "Let them who raise the spell beware the fiend."

A curious nemesis stalked behind Van Buren. By politics, in the disparaging sense, he made himself, and by politics he was destroyed at the time when he was best fitted by age, experience and a kind of purification to be of most service to his country. The chief episode of his early career was his duel with De Witt Clinton for the control of New York. The Federalists had ceased to exist as a party, but they had votes and influence. Their leader in New York was Rufus King. Van Buren succeeded in discrediting Clinton with his own party by making it appear that he would support King for the United States Senate, while in reality he himself secured King's election. It was a political debt which King paid. Clinton was driven from the governorship, and the power passed to Van Buren's junta, the Albany Regency, which established the boss system in succession to the family system of the Livingstones and Clintons. But the Regency made the mistake of depriving Clinton of his last office, as member of the Canal Board; and in consequence the people returned the father of the Erie Canal to the governorship. "There is such a thing as killing a man too dead," remarked Van Buren ruefully.

In national politics he and Jackson formed the most intimate alliance known in our political history. Van Buren managed Jackson's campaign in 1828, became his Secretary of State, and consolidated his machine by the drastic use of patronage, which the Regency had practiced at Albany. Jackson selected Van Buren as Vice President for his second term, and passed on the presidency to him. It was as scapegoat for Jackson's measures, however, that Van Buren was beaten in 1840. Four years later, Jackson, "who loved him like a son," unwittingly struck him down again. The leading issue was the annexation of Texas, and Van Buren, contrary to his habitual caution, came out openly against it. But Jackson had written the year

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

before a letter approving it, which was used to divide Van Buren's support and defeat him for the nomination. The most striking instance of the political nemesis occurred in this campaign of 1844. To give greater *éclat* to his nomination for the vice-presidency in 1832, Van Buren's friends in the convention invented the two-thirds rule, and this rule was invoked in the convention of 1844. Among the many innovations in American politics for which Van Buren is held responsible, the role of the Democratic candidate who leads his party convention with a majority, but can never muster the required two-thirds, was the most distressing to his legatees, from Douglas to Champ Clark and McAdoo.

Mr. Lynch has not written so successful a biography from the point of view of the general reader as in his "'Boss' Tweed." The present story is more complicated. Mr. Lynch has mastered the web of alliance and intrigue which constituted New York politics during the rivalries of Livingstones and Clintons, of Barnburners and Hunkers, but it is impossible to present the mass of material adequately and interestingly. There are necessarily a good many obscure references, and some minor slips. It was the election of 1824 that Jackson accused Clay of stealing from him, not that of 1828 (page 478). Solomon Van Rensselaer was Adjutant General of the state, not Attorney General (page 208). What is important, however, is that, as in the case of "'Boss' Tweed," Mr. Lynch gives us little interpretation of his hero. We see Van Buren in his external presentment, five feet six, slender, with long, curling yellow hair, carefully dressed and always smiling; we follow his activities, which are often amusing and curious illustrations of American politics, but of the man's inner reaction to life we get nothing. It is true, Van Buren's own testimony gives his biographer little help. Among his innovations were "noncommitalism" on public questions, and the conventional falsehood of the candidate that he never sought office, or desired anything except retirement.

The test of Van Buren's career came when, in 1848, he allowed himself to be nominated by the Free Soilers, split the Democratic party, and defeated Lewis Cass. Historians generally assume that this was his last master stroke in politics, in revenge for the failure of the party to nominate him four years earlier. Mr. Lynch takes the ground that this action was the result of a sincere conviction, which had been growing since the annexation of Texas was mooted, that the slave power must be curbed. He pictures the Free Soil campaign of 1848 as like the Progressive campaign of 1912—a revival service led by an ex-President, and explains Van Buren's subsequent relapse into regularity as owing to his faith in the Compromise of 1850. Mr. Lynch makes out a good *prima facie* case, but he has not left himself space for its elaboration. He leaves us, however, with the conviction that, if any statesman could have substituted a political for a military solution of the problem of slavery, it was Van Buren, the supreme master of American politics. It was a national tragedy that, in the fulness of his strength and with courage born of experience, he was set aside for Tyler, Polk, Taylor, Fillmore, Pierce and Buchanan.

Polk's "Diary" brings us more intimately into the atmosphere of national politics in the forties. There is a great contrast between Van Buren and the man who, through the compromise necessitated by the two-thirds rule, took from him the presidency in 1844. Van Buren was lively, brilliant, popular. Polk was quiet, shy, unknown; Van Buren was accustomed to the ways of men, spoke their language, worked easily with them and gained their devotion. Polk seldom spoke in public, surrounded himself with personalities smaller than his own, and wore himself out doing their work. Van Buren had experience and a wide view of affairs; Polk had caution and a meticulous habit of detail. His diary is a faithful picture of the life of the president of a small state, whose chief preoccupation was the meetings of his cabinet, which were apparently barren, and whose only relaxation was going to church. Mr. Nevins has shortened the record and furnished it with excellent notes, most of them concerned with correcting Polk's opinions of his co-workers, especially his generals, which were characteristically narrow and sour.

Certain misconceptions, the editor points out, are corrected by the diary. Polk was chosen by the South to consummate the annexation of Texas, and his own pet project was to secure California. He did not, however, deliberately seek war with Mexico to accomplish these ends, or prolong it for political advantage. Before the outbreak of hostilities, he sent Slidell as commissioner to Mexico, which refused to receive him. Later he sent Nicholas Trist with Scott's army, to offer terms of peace and $30,000,000 purchase money. At the outset a quarrel between Trist and Scott, and later the difficulty of finding a government in Mexico to deal with, delayed negotiations, and the final price was cut to $15,000,000. The war, as Mr. Nevins points out, was efficiently conducted without the usual circumstance of financiers and industrialists making a lot of money out of their fellow-countrymen. Moreover, Polk was by no means the tool of the slave power. He stands out sharply in contrast to Pierce and Buchanan. He was a man, although intrinsically a small one.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

Mr. Dobrée's Intuitions

The Lamp and the Lute, Studies in Six Modern Authors, by Bonamy Dobrée. New York: Oxford University Press. 133 pages. $2.

THE lectures on Ibsen, Hardy, Kipling, Forster, Lawrence and Eliot, which form this volume, are Mr. Dobrée's first attempts at contemporary criticism. Readers familiar with his earlier work on seventeenth-century drama will be disappointed by the comparatively loose and disorderly style, and by the gingerly fashion in which he handles his principal ideas. Mr. Dobrée himself apologizes in his preface; explaining that the lectures were addressed to a popular and ill-informed audience, and may contain "some of those generalizations into which one launches, which may be well enough to say, but which it is, perhaps, ill-advised to print."

But it would be a mistake to dismiss the book from serious consideration. Apologies should be accepted, lapses run lightly over, and the attention turned to the substance of the criticism. "The point of interest for me," Mr. Dobrée writes, "has been to determine what the work of various writers is about, namely, what it is that has troubled their minds enough to impel them insistently to write it." The impulse, the *donnée* of a particular writer, he calls that writer's "intuition," by which he means "merely the recognition that a thing is so." And further, Mr. Dobrée states as a kind of final dogma: "This part of the ultimate business of criticism is to discover, not only the intuition, but the worth of the intuition, for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the position we give to a work of art must be based on value: the other part is to discover how, and how well, the intuition has been conveyed."

Mr. Dobrée thus associates himself with the critical work of Herbert Read, E. M. Forster and I. A. Richards. Something more than influence is exerted by T. S. Eliot in the lecture of that name, where indeed many of the pages are merely a gentle dilution of Eliot's own critical principles.

This doctrine of intuition and the mental features which give it form are gradually emerging as the index or chief principle of a very definite and very modern sensibility. Because, so far, it has been a very consciously undertaken doctrine, its application is uncertain and intermittent, and is likely to tie to mental panaceas and magic phrases such as Humanism or the Will.

Mr. Dobrée says nothing of Humanism, but he has a great deal to say about the Will, either directly or indirectly, in each of these six lectures. This is what binds the book together, this notion of the Will as the fatal impulse of Life—I do not say it unites the men discussed. In the lecture on Ibsen, for example: "Indeed, is not the 'life's design,' in itself really just such a function of the will? Is not the Gyntian ego the same as the Gyntian will? . . . This is surely at bottom the problem of existence as it presented itself to Ibsen, the failure of the will to impose its own conditions." In Kipling, he finds the will to action and is able to remark, "There he is the priest of the Mysterious Will, who causes all things to come in their due time." Kipling's failures, he finds, are caused often by an incomplete intuition, a failure of "assent" in Newman's sense; which amounts to an incomplete knowledge of the will. And finally, writing of Eliot, Mr. Dobrée says: "But above all, Mr. Eliot, if I rightly understand his recent utterances, looks to the will to oppose the flux. . . . He believes that there is a changeless truth, the search for which is the main object of man's will, and without which man's will would be meaningless."

This is the nearest to an exact definition of the will that Mr. Dobrée makes, but he quotes with approval a passage from Landor to the effect that when mysteries are unveiled the virtue of the mystery disappears. He evidently believes that the intuition of this mysterious will is the artist's prime business and that his subsequent labor should be the expression of the forms in which that intuition was received—that Kipling, for example, should write about the will as it inspires the life of action. Certainly, by hanging each of his lectures somehow upon the notion, he has contrived to be illuminating. In distinguishing the intuitions of his different authors, he sets those authors clearly apart and gives each something of his individuality. But, unless the intuition of the will is made to mean much more than it does here, it cannot produce really satisfactory criticism; it can only indicate the kind of meaning to look for in a given author. Mr. Dobrée's own "Histriophone," or his essay on Congreve's dialogue, is really much better criticism because, besides dealing with the essential purpose of comic drama (not there referred to the will), he indissolubly fastens that purpose to dramatic technique, a combination which displays the real substance of the plays. In this volume, most of the lectures irritate because they fail to make such a combination; the lecture on Lawrence least of all, for there Mr. Dobrée touches frequently the real substance as well as the impulse of Lawrence's work.

R. P. Blackmur.

The Imperial Dollar

The Imperial Dollar, by Hiram Motherwell. New York: Brentano's. 310 pages. $3.50.

THIS new and contradictory America of ours—grasping and generous, self-assertive and timid—is the subject here of another book, broadly thought out and thoroughly interesting. The machine, of which so many have been telling us recently, is the starting point of this study. But, whereas other writers for the most part have been concerned with what the machine is doing to America, Mr. Motherwell deals with the effect which America, by virtue of the machine, is having on the rest of the world. This effect is manifold, and can be seen alike in American credits to European peoples and in the manners of American tourists on boulevard *terrasses*. Mr. Motherwell limits his field, so far as detailed treatment is concerned, to economic phenomena which can be weighed and measured, but not to the neglect of the social and cultural implications of America's new power on earth.

There is, of course, nothing startlingly novel in the author's conception that the United States since the War has become an empire by the might of the dollar. But he has brought together a formidable mass of information on how this empire was created, what it is doing and what it is likely to do in the future. In treating of this empire of the dollar, Mr. Motherwell insists on his own definition of "empire." To him it does not at all mean political sovereignty. It is often most effective, he finds, when it is unseen and unfelt. So he defines it simply as "exclusive influence exercised by one nation over another politically distinct nation or community." That influence he finds extending throughout the world and over powerful nations as well as weak ones. Sometimes the United States has exercised that influence frankly and by force, as in its imposition of its will in the Caribbean. Sometimes it has done so with a soft and skillful hand, as in the diplomacy which resulted in the Dawes Plan.

Mr. Motherwell believes that the basis of this new empire of ours is the machine, which, by sending its products out beyond the boundaries of the United States, has created a surplus of wealth which must also be put to work in foreign lands. The machine has waxed greatest in America because within America's own borders is a wide and prosperous market, unimpeded by the customs barriers that clutter Europe. This market has enabled the machine to get on a quantity production basis and thus produce goods cheaply enough to compete in the foreign field. As the machine grows greater, of course, it must drive deeper and deeper into foreign markets. It dare not stop or greatly slacken its speed, for if it did, it would be crushed under the weight of its gigantic overhead. And so, both American dollars and American gadgets are roving the world for employment.

Such a process has its dangers and difficulties for both the United States and the countries over which American industry and finance are casting their influence. But there are cheering prospects as well. Without espousing this new imperialism, Mr. Motherwell asserts that the United States must, for the sake of its own profit and safety, be altruistic. "It cannot long prosper by taking things from others," he says. "It must eventually seek to sell things to others." Thus the dollar wins profits for its American owners, but in so doing it "fertilizes fields, furnishes markets to industry, suppresses plagues, nurtures hopes." And, most important of all, perhaps, he sees in this new im-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RUSSIAN BAZAAR

17 West 57 Street Wickersham 8887

Open until 8 p. m.

Step aside from your every-day world and see the *Collection of Peasant Handicraft* which has been imported from *Moscow, Nijni-Novgorod, Bokhara, the Ural Mountains, the Ukraine,* the *Caucasus,* and from the *Far North,*

FOR YOUR SELECTION of CHRISTMAS GIFTS

Carved and Lacquered Woodenware, Hand Embroidered Linens, Cashmere Printed Shawls Tartar Boudoir Slippers, Miniature Palekh Boxes, Hand Woven Rugs, Samovars, Toys, Candy, etc.

OFFERED AT VERY LOW PRICES

from 25 cents up

by the

Paxton Hibben Memorial Hospital Fund

(for the equipment of an American Hospital for Children in the U. S. S. R.)

DEBATE: Is Modern Marriage a Failure?

YES! says BERTRAND **RUSSELL**

NO! says JOHN COWPER **POWYS**

Chairman HEYWOOD **BROUN**

MECCA TEMPLE, 55th St. 7th Ave.

Friday Eve., Dec. 13, 8.30

Tickets $1.00—$1.50—$2.00—$2.75

On sale at the Box-office, Circle 0034, Columbia University Book Store, Rand School Book Store, New School, Civic Club, and the

DISCUSSION GUILD, 15 E. 40 St., Lex. 7483

CONSEQUENCES

by Julia Ellsworth Ford Author of IMAGINA

John Haynes Holmes says:

"'Consequences' tells a thrilling story. It handles with conviction and idealism the theme of a great humanitarian cause. The author sets forth the horrors of the opium habit in the Far East and the growing enslavement of our own world to a traffic which has long since subdued the world of India and China."

Syud Hossain says:

"Julia Ford has dealt with a great theme seriously, yet with wit and with humor. The story maintains its grip from first to last."

$2.50 at all bookshop.

The Authors and Titles alone Challenge Attention to

The New North American Review *(at Half Price)*

By JAMES A. FARRELL
President U. S. Steel Corporation
HOW CAN WE INSURE AMERICAN PROSPERITY?
An extremely timely article on the Promise of our Foreign Trade

By LEWIS H. HANEY
Director, N. Y. U. Bureau of Business Research
WHO GETS THE MONEY?
A striking discussion of the Wall Street Crisis

By JANE COWL
WHAT AN ACTRESS THINKS ABOUT AUDIENCES

By DR. E. E. FREE
WHO ARE THE GREATEST IN SCIENCE?

By GLEB BOTKIN
Son of the Personal Physician to Czar Nicholas II
AN AMERICAN IN THE MAKING
The Conversion of an Aristocrat to U. S. Citizenship

By HAMILTON FISH, JR.
Noted Member of Congress from New York
THE CHALLENGE OF THE AGED
A Plea for a Group America Has Neglected

By STORM JAMESON
SEVEN LITTLE FOXES
A Suavely Humorous Christmas Story

By CLEON C. MASON, M.D.
Child Specialist
FADS THAT MISLEAD PARENTS

Informative news value, originality and writing that is entertainingly clever characterize the January NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. Prof. Hughes Mearns, distinguished educator, tells how our school system is spoiling our children's minds; John Gunther, brilliant young foreign correspondent, writes of the madly logical handling of maternity in Russia.

A Score of Fascinating Articles and Stories in Each Issue.

SPECIAL INTRODUCTORY OFFER
5 MONTHS FOR ONE DOLLAR

On the newsstands THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW sells for 40 cents per copy. You may have the next 5 numbers for one dollar—half the newsstand price. Each edition of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW is limited. We therefore suggest you fill in and sign the coupon now.

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW,
9 East 37th Street, New York City,

For the enclosed $1.00 send me THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for 5 months. (Canadian price $1.25—Foreign price $1.50.)

Name.....

Address.....

City.....

State..... N.R. 12-11

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perialism an enormous force for peace. There is no conceivable war in the world, he believes, which could add to America's strength or fail to injure her interests. And so, imperialists need not be good. They need only be wise.

One may quarrel with minor points in Mr. Motherwell's study. Sometimes his economics seem to get a bit out of hand. Sometimes he grants a prescience to our kings of industry and finance which they seem hardly to merit. But his main thesis can hardly be disputed.

HAROLD NORMAN DENNY.

The Growth of Reason

The Growth of Reason, by Frank Lorimer. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 243 pages. $3.75.

TO TRACE the growth of reason, this book sweeps over many fields and touches upon a thousand and one problems. There is a rapid and considerable shift of interest from physiological, psychological, genetic, to logical and metaphysical aspects of reason. This is unquestionably a valuable contribution to philosophy with ample suggestions for research. It is based on concrete material derived from observations and experiments of various investigators.

Mr. Lorimer does not trace systematically either the historical development of reason in the race or the individual development of reason (from infancy to senility); nor does he thoroughly describe the structure and function of reason in science, philosophy and society. He sketches only certain developmental aspects. He is concerned primarily with the growth in children of language, the symbolic process, reason. In the latter part of the book, he neglects the growth of reason and becomes absorbed in minute details of certain parts of the structure of reason. It can be said that there is a shift from a functional (dynamic) to a structural (analytic) account of the different levels in the development of reason.

Markey in "The Symbolic Process" (1928—the same series) covers much of the field explored by the present author. With a genetic approach in common, both authors are interested in the symbolic process and its integration in children. Continuity throughout the various kinds of symbolic processes is assumed. The role of social factors, of the environment, in the upbuilding of symbolic processes is emphasized. If Markey brings sociology to bear, the present author introduces philosophical problems. It is curious to note that Lorimer's only discussion of "The Symbolic Process" is destructive, and arbitrarily waves aside the emphasis on studying the use of personal pronominal symbols (I, you, he, etc.) as an important index of the growth of the symbolic processes in children.

Mr. Lorimer over-accentuates, perhaps, the importance and superiority of the verbal symbolic process and is indifferent to "higher" non-verbal symbolic processes. Imageless thoughts and levels of mental reactions (both of which have been written upon by Professor Woodworth) point the way to non-verbal symbolic processes which may be vastly superior to the verbal ones. Wordless and imageless thoughts make possible, apparently, shortcuts in thinking, enabling the mind to grasp in an instant a wide range of ideas. In the last analysis, the comparative values of the verbal and non-verbal thoughts are determinable only by experimentation. The complex phenomena of reason, the various twists and quirks of thinking, sudden insight (such as is stressed by the Gestalt psychologists), creative imagination, are yet to be thoroughly explored by science.

NATHAN ISRAELI.

Little Novels, by Arthur Schnitzler. New York: Simon and Schuster. $2.50.

THE people in Arthur Schnitzler's "Little Novels" are motivated by two obsessions: sexual infidelity and the inevitable machinery of the plots conceived by the master himself. The lives of these diminutive Viennese actresses and nobles, playwrights and countesses, are necessarily gay, and brief. They have enough reality to display Schnitzler's understanding of human psychology and his intimacy with pre-War Vienna, but no more; the graceful, neat pattern of the Schnitzler short story decapitates them and they vanish forever. Of the ten stories in the volume, four are noteworthy: "The Fate of the Baron," "The Death of a Bachelor," "Andreas Thameyer's Last Letter," and "The Prophecy." All deal directly with the familiar triangle: love, mystery and death. In almost every case, death is used as an instrument to disclose the unfaithful wife or mistress, and the story comes to an end. For Arthur Schnitzler would have us believe that living is futile business at its best, a stiff dose of saccharin, coated with cynicism. In one instance, the story of a blind beggar, "Blind Geronimo," saccharin is offered straight, but Schnitzler is too skilful an artisan to repeat the performance; he is content to drown his tears in absinthe.

H. G.

Idolaters, by Dale Collins. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. $2.50.

THIS tale is written to entertain. On an island in the Dutch East Indies a cast of strongly contrasted characters has been assembled. April Rose, whose beauty is enhanced by the fact that she is a mute, and Mr. Dave, a short-tempered dwarf and contortionist who is her guardian, hail from the music halls of England. Miles Courtney, meek, weak and middle-aged, is an unfrocked minister of the Church of England. Although he lacks a church, he is one of those rare missionaries who have a sense of humor. To Pieter Pieters, a Boer who hates the English, falls the lot of representing the strong, simple pioneer, close to the soil and uncomplicated. A cruel native sultan and a Cockney woman with a taste for brandy and a past, both of them as arrogant as weeds, complete the group. To the *ad lib.* piping of Mr. Collins, these queer folk dance queer steps. The pace is varied. The glossy colors of the tropics are artfully used. Only rarely and at short intervals are they obtrusive. If a slightly less stilted sentence order had been observed, the book would have been one of the best in its class this season.

C. A. C.

Contributors

CRAIG F. THOMSON is a member of the staff of The New York World.

CARLETON BEALS, a resident of Mexico, is the author of "Mexico, an Interpretation," and other books.

ROBERT P. TRISTRAM COFFIN has written several books of verse.

PAUL ROSENFELD is the author of "Boy in the Sun," a novel, and several books of criticism.

DOROTHY REID is the author of "Coach into Pumpkin," a book of poems.

R. P. BLACKMUR, poet and critic, was until recently an editor of The Hound and Horn.

HAROLD NORMAN DENNY is a New York newspaper man, and the author of "Dollars for Bullets."

NATHAN ISRAELI contributes reviews to various psychological journals.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED